arXiv:1605.01158v1 [math.PR] 4 May 2016

Geometric structures of late points of a two-dimensional simple random walk

Izumi Okada

Abstract

We consider the problem, as suggested by Dembo (2003, 2006), of late points of a simple random walk in two dimensions. It has been shown that the exponents for the numbers of pairs of late points coincide with those of nearly favorite points and high points in the Gaussian free field, whose exact values are known. We estimate the exponents for the numbers of a multipoint set of late points in average and in probability. While there have been observed certain similarities between among three classes of points, our results exhibit a difference.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we will study the properties of special sites, called late points, in a two-dimensional random walk. In particular, we will solve the unsolved problem posed in Open problem 4 in [4] and Open problem 4.3 in [5], which correspond to an extension of the results in [9]. The cover time is the time when a simple random walk in $\mathbb{Z}_n^2 (= \mathbb{Z}^2/n\mathbb{Z}^2)$ has visited every point of $\mathbb{Z}_n^2$, and a late point of a simple random walk in $\mathbb{Z}_n^2$ is a point of $\mathbb{Z}_n^2$ of which the first hitting time is close to the cover time in a certain specific sense. About sixty years ago, Erdős and Taylor [15] proposed a problem concerning a simple random walk in $\mathbb{Z}^d$. Over forty years later, Dembo, Peres, Rosen and Zeitouni [6, 7, 8] solved it and some related problems by developing innovative proofs. These methods provided results concerning late points in $\mathbb{Z}_n^2$, verified in [9], which showed that the number of late points in various sized clusters have a variety of power growth exponents. Although the topic is classical, many questions related to it have only recently been propounded and investigated, and not much is known about late points.

We define the set of α-late points in $\mathbb{Z}_n^2$ as $\mathcal{L}_n(\alpha)$ for $0 < \alpha < 1$ as in [9] (see (2.1) in the next section). In this paper, we will obtain certain asymptotic estimates, say (A) (in average) and (B) (in probability), of

$$|\{(x_1, ..., x_j) \in \mathcal{L}_n(\alpha)^j : d(x_i, x_l) \le n^\beta \text{ for any } 1 \le i, l \le j\}|$$

for any $0 < \alpha, \beta < 1$ and $j \in \mathbb{N}$.

We have two main motivations for the present study of α-late points.

First, we wish to understand the structure of the random field of a local time as a configuration of late points. In particular, we want to determine the relationship between the special points of a random walk and those of a Gaussian free field (GFF). In fact, there are several related known results. For $0 < \alpha < 1$, the known results study the set of α-high points of the GFF in $\mathbb{Z}_n^2$ (sites where GFF takes high values) and α-favorite points in $\mathbb{Z}^2$ (sites where the local time is close to the most frequently visited site). For $j = 2$, [9] obtained the result corresponding to (A), and Brummelhuis and Hilhorst [2] obtained that corresponding to (B). Daviaud [3] estimated the number of pairs of α-high points of the GFF in the same forms as (A) and (B). We will estimate similarly for α-favorite points in a forthcoming paper. In each case, the exponent coincides with that of (A) or (B).

Second, we argue that the geometric structures of α-late points can be used to obtain the diverse large deviation estimates of the local time or high moment of functionals of the local time. This is similar to the research of α-high points and α-favorite points. In general, the limit theorem for random variables has a connection with its large deviation estimates or high moment. We believe that these

estimations of the local time carry the asymptotic of various functionals of the local time. In fact, as Proposition 12 mentions later, these are connected with the geometric structures of α-late points. In addition, result (A) is almost equivalent to estimates of the second moments of $|\mathcal{L}_n(\alpha)|$.

2 Known results and main results

To state our main results, we will introduce notations as follows. Let d be the Euclidean distance and $\mathbb{N} := \{1, 2, \cdots\}$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $D(x, r) := \{y \in \mathbb{Z}_n^2 : d(x, y) < r\}$ and for any $G \subset \mathbb{Z}_n^2$, $\partial G := \{y \in G^c : d(x, y) = 1 \text{ for some } x \in G\}$. For $x \in \mathbb{Z}_n^2$, we sometimes omit $\{\}$ in writing the one-point set $\{x\}$. Let $\{S_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ be a simple random walk on a 2-dimensional square lattice. Let P^x denote the probability of a simple random walk starting at x. We will simply write P for P^0. Let $K(n, x)$ be the number of times the simple random walk visits x up to time n, that is, $K(n, x) = \sum_{i=0}^{n} 1_{\{S_i = x\}}$. For any $D \subset \mathbb{Z}_n^2$, let $T_D := \inf\{m \geq 1 : S_m \in D\}$. For simplicity, we will write $T_{x_1,\ldots,x_j}$ for $T_{\{x_1,\ldots,x_j\}}$. Let $\tau_n := \inf\{m \geq 0 : S_m \in \partial D(0, n)\}$. We will use the same notations for a simple random walk in $\mathbb{Z}^2$. In addition, $\lceil a \rceil$ denotes the smallest integer n with $n \geq a$.

Now, we will introduce the known results for α-late points in $\mathbb{Z}_n^2$. Originally, [6] estimated the cover time of a simple random walk in $\mathbb{Z}_n^2$, that is,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\max_{x\in\mathbb{Z}_n^2} T_x}{(n \log n)^2} = \frac{4}{\pi} \quad \text{in probability.}$$

For $0 < \alpha < 1$, we will define the set of α-late points in $\mathbb{Z}_n^2$ such that

$$\mathcal{L}_n(\alpha) := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{Z}_n^2 : \frac{T_x}{(n \log n)^2} \geq \frac{4\alpha}{\pi} \right\}. \tag{2.1}$$

[2] showed (B) for $j = 2$, and, [9] showed (A) for $j = 2$. Theorem 1.4 of [9] estimated the power growth exponent of pairs of α-late points within distance n^β of each other. We will extend this to a *full multi-fractal analysis.*

Theorem 1. *For any $0 < \alpha, \beta < 1$ and $j \in \mathbb{N}$*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log E[|\{(x_1, ..., x_j) \in \mathcal{L}_n(\alpha)^j : d(x_i, x_l) \leq n^\beta \text{ for any } 1 \leq i, l \leq j\}|]}{\log n} = \hat{\rho}_j(\alpha, \beta),$$

where

$$\hat{\rho}_j(\alpha, \beta) := \begin{cases} 2 + 2(j-1)\beta - \frac{2j\alpha}{(1-\beta)(j-1)+1} & (\beta \leq 1 + \frac{1-\sqrt{j\alpha}}{j-1}), \\ 2(j + 1 - 2\sqrt{j\alpha}) & (\beta \geq 1 + \frac{1-\sqrt{j\alpha}}{j-1}). \end{cases}$$

We will extend the condition $d(x_i, x_l) \leq n^\beta$ to be more general in Section 6.

Theorem 2. *For any $0 < \alpha, \beta < 1$ and $j \in \mathbb{N}$ in probability*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log |\{(x_1, ..., x_j) \in \mathcal{L}_n(\alpha)^j : d(x_i, x_l) \leq n^\beta \text{ for any } 1 \leq i, l \leq j\}|}{\log n} = \rho_j(\alpha, \beta),$$

where

$$\rho_j(\alpha, \beta) := \begin{cases} 2 + 2(j-1)\beta - \frac{2j\alpha}{(1-\beta)(j-1)+1} & (\beta \leq \frac{j}{j-1}(1 - \sqrt{\alpha})), \\ 4j(1 - \sqrt{\alpha}) - 2j(1 - \sqrt{\alpha})^2/\beta & (\beta \geq \frac{j}{j-1}(1 - \sqrt{\alpha})). \end{cases}$$

Therefore, the mean and median numbers of multipoints have different orders of magnitude. If late points were spread out uniformly in $\mathbb{Z}_n^2$, the limit in Theorem 2 would be $2+2(j-1)\beta-2j\alpha$. However, we obtain much larger exponents in Theorems 1 and 2. To state the relationship between $\hat{\rho}_j(\alpha,\beta)$ and $\rho_j(\alpha,\beta)$, for $0<\beta<1$, γ and $h>0$, respectively, let

$$F_{h,\beta}(\gamma)=\frac{1-\gamma\beta}{1-\beta}+h\gamma^2\beta.$$

It can easily be checked that

$$\rho_j(\alpha,\beta)=2+2(j-1)\beta-2\alpha\inf_{\gamma\in\Gamma_{\alpha,\beta}}F_{j,\beta}(\gamma),$$

where

$$\Gamma_{\alpha,\beta}=\{\gamma\geq 0: 2-2\beta-2\alpha F_{0,\beta}(\gamma)\geq 0\}.$$

It is also easy to verify that

$$\hat{\rho}_j(\alpha,\beta)=\sup_{\beta'\leq\beta}\sup_{\gamma\geq 0}\{2+2(j-1)\beta'-2\alpha F_{j,\beta'}(\gamma)\},\tag{2.2}$$

and so the difference between $\rho_j(\alpha,\beta)$ and $\hat{\rho}_j(\alpha,\beta)$ is that the supremum in (2.2) is not subjected to the constraint $\gamma\in\Gamma_{\alpha,\beta}$. We will now explain why we need to restrict the domain of a function $F_{j,\beta}(\gamma)$ in $\Gamma_{\alpha,\beta}$ to have $\rho_j(\alpha,\beta)$. As [4, 5] mentioned, if we estimate Theorem 2, we are tempted to consider the following wrong heuristic: if we set $A(n^\beta,a_n):=\{z\in(\lceil n^\beta\rceil\mathbb{Z}_n^2)\cap\mathbb{Z}_n^2$: a simple random walk goes and returns to $\partial D(z,n^\beta)$ via some closed circle a_n times up to time $4\alpha(n\log n)^2/\pi$ $\}$, in probability

$$\begin{aligned}
&E[|\text{set of multipoints which are } \alpha\text{-late points within distance } n^\beta \text{ of each other}|]\\
&=n^{2+2(j-1)\beta}\\
&\times P(x_1,...,x_j \text{ are } \alpha\text{-late points when } d(x_i,x_l) \text{ is close to } n^\beta(\forall i,l\leq j))\\
&\approx (\text{Typical value of such number of multipoints})\\
&\approx \max_{a_n\in\mathbb{N}}E[|A(n^\beta,a_n)|]\times\left(\frac{E[|\mathcal{L}_n(\alpha)\cap D(z,n^\beta)|;z\in A(n^\beta,a_n)]}{P(z\in A(n^\beta,a_n))}\right)^j.
\end{aligned}$$

This approximation is discussed in [2]. In fact, we only have to consider $\{a_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ with

$$P(|\{z\in(\lceil n^\beta\rceil\mathbb{Z}_n^2)\cap\mathbb{Z}_n^2: z\in A(n^\beta,a_n)\}|\geq 1)\to 1.$$

This restriction corresponds to (4.55) and, hence, that of $F_{j,\beta}(\gamma)$ restricted in $\Gamma_{\alpha,\beta}$. Therefore, we obtain different quantities for the exponent in probability from that in average.

As mentioned in Section 1, it is known that there exist some relationships between late points, favorite points and high points. We will now introduce known results about the latter two types of points.

First, we will explain the high points of the GFF in $\mathbb{Z}_n^2$. In general, it is known that GFF is a central model of random surfaces. Sheffield [20] provided a mathematical survey of the GFF. In addition, Bolthausen et al. [1] showed that in probability,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{\max_{x\in\mathbb{Z}_n^2}\phi_n(x)}{\log n}=2\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}},$$

where $\{\phi_n(x)\}_{x\in\mathbb{Z}_n^2}$ is the GFF whose definition is the same as that in [1, 3]. In what follows, for $0<\alpha<1$, we will define the set of α-high points of the GFF such that

$$\mathcal{V}_n(\alpha):=\left\{x\in\mathbb{Z}_n^2:\frac{\phi_n(x)^2}{2}\geq\frac{4\alpha}{\pi}(\log n)^2\right\}.$$

[3] showed that if $\mathcal{L}_n(\alpha)$ in Theorems 1 and 2 is changed into $\mathcal{V}_n(\alpha)$ for $j = 2$, each exponent is the same as that of Theorems 1 and 2. In addition, there are some interesting results concerning a relationship between the local time of a random walk and a GFF. Eisenbaum et al. [12] provided a powerful equivalence law called the generalized second Ray-Knight theorem. Ding et al. [10, 11] showed a strong connection between the expected maximum of the GFF and the expected cover time.

Next, we will introduce the known results of favorite points. Erdős and Taylor [15] showed that for a simple random walk in $\mathbb{Z}^d$ with $d \geq 3$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\max_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d} K(n,x)}{\log n} = \frac{1}{-\log P(T_0 < \infty)} \quad \text{a.s.}$$

For $\mathbb{Z}^2$, they obtained

$$\frac{1}{4\pi} \leq \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\max_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^2} K(n,x)}{(\log n)^2} \leq \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{\max_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^2} K(n,x)}{(\log n)^2} \leq \frac{1}{\pi} \quad \text{a.s.},$$

and conjectured that the limit exists and is almost surely (a.s.) to. Forty years later, Dembo et al. [7] verified this conjecture. In fact, they showed that for a simple random walk in $\mathbb{Z}^2$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\max_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^2} K(\tau_n,x)}{(\log n)^2} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{4\max_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^2} K(n,x)}{(\log n)^2} = \frac{4}{\pi} \quad \text{a.s.}$$

Subsequently, Rosen [19] provided another proof of this. In [7, 9], for $0 < \alpha < 1$, the set of α-favorite points in $\mathbb{Z}^2$ is defined such that

$$\Psi_n(\alpha) := \left\{ x \in D(0,n) : K(\tau_n,x) \geq \left\lceil \frac{4\alpha}{\pi} (\log n)^2 \right\rceil \right\}.$$

We will show in our forthcoming paper that if $\mathcal{L}_n(\alpha)$ in Theorems 1 and 2 is changed into $\Psi_n(\alpha)$, each exponent for $j = 2$ is the same as that of Theorems 2.1 and 2.2. In addition, there are a few known results concerning the geometric structure of favorite points. For example, in [18], we showed that the favorite point of the simple random in $\mathbb{Z}^d$ with $d \geq 2$ does not appear in the inner boundary from some time on a.s. Additional open problems concerning the geometric structure of favorite points have been raised by Erdős and Révész [13, 14] and Shi and Tóth [21], but almost no definite solution for them is known for multi-dimensional walks.

Next, we will explain the summary of proofs for Theorems 1 and 2. In this paper, we uniquely develop three main ideas, (I), (II) and (III).

(I) Matrix's arguments

For use in the proof of the upper bound, we will consider the special set of the matrices $\mathcal{M}_j$ ($\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_j$) in Subsection 3.3. Now, we will explain the difficulty of the proof of the upper bound. For example, if we consider the value in Theorem 1, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} & E[|\{(x_1,...,x_j) \in \mathcal{L}_n(\alpha)^j : d(x_i,x_l) \leq n^\beta \text{ for any } 1 \leq i,l \leq j\}|] \\ = & \sum_{\substack{d(x_i,x_l)\leq n^\beta, \\ x_i \in \mathbb{Z}_n^2}} P(x_1,...,x_j \in \mathcal{L}_n(\alpha)). \end{aligned}$$

Consider the sequences $\{x_i^{(n)}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ with $x_i^{(n)} \in \mathbb{Z}_n^2$ for $1 \leq i \leq 3$. Hence, if we estimate $\hat{\rho}_3(\alpha,\beta)$, from the symmetry of $x_1^{(n)}$, $x_2^{(n)}$ and $x_3^{(n)}$, it is plausible that we need to consider the following two positions:

$$\begin{aligned} & (1) d(x_1^{(n)},x_2^{(n)}) \approx d(x_2^{(n)},x_3^{(n)}) \approx d(x_3^{(n)},x_1^{(n)}), \\ & (2) d(x_1^{(n)},x_2^{(n)}) << d(x_1^{(n)},x_3^{(n)}), d(x_2^{(n)},x_3^{(n)}), \end{aligned}$$

where $a_n \approx b_n$ means $\log a_n / \log b_n \to 1$ as $n \to \infty$ for any sequence. In general $j \in \mathbb{N}$, there are various positions of $(x_1, ..., x_j)$ which we need to compute and, hence, we need some original computation for multipoints. Thus, we need to observe properties of $\mathcal{M}_j$ for $j \in \mathbb{N}$, which correspond to properties of a variety of positions. For example, we will divide $\mathcal{M}_j$ into the value of some function Ξ (as introduced later) and argue the relationship with the summation of all the elements of a certain matrix in $\mathcal{M}_j$. In particular, Proposition 7 (or Lemma 9) is interesting and important since the proof depends on remarkable properties of $\mathcal{M}_j$ and corresponds to key estimates for main results.

(II) The information of Green's function

We will estimate hitting probabilities for some subset in $\mathbb{Z}_n^2$ until some stopping time in Subsection 3.1, and apply these arguments to Lemma 15. To obtain Lemma 15, we need to compute hitting probabilities to a variety of subsets and stopping times, which can't be simply computed. Our results imply that there exists a strong connection between such hitting probabilities and a matrix of Green's function of a simple random walk.

(III) Enumeration of a Markov chain's path

We will use the certain general Markov chain rule studied in Subsection 3.2. In fact, we will estimate the probabilities under the condition on a local time of some edges in the graph.

Now, we will explain how they lead to our main result with the above three ideas. The proof of the upper bound in Theorem 2 partially relies on the proof in [9], in which, they chose many small circles and considered the probability that pair points in the circle were not covered by a random walk under the condition of a crossing number around the circle. We will extend this result by changing pair points to multipoints. The result of Lemma 13 corresponds to that of Lemma 6.1 in [9]. However, the method of the proof of Lemma 13 is completely different and uses the above ideas (II) and (III). In particular, we will replace the information regarding the combination of paths conditioned by the excursions of the random walk to that of the Markov chain's path which we obtained using idea (III). In addition, with Lemma 13, we will produce the proof of the upper bound in Theorems 1 and 2 using idea (I). For example, Lemma 10 implies that for $\{x_i^{(n)}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ with $x_i^{(n)} \in \mathbb{Z}_n^2$ $(1 \le i \le j)$, we only need to consider the position that is close to $d(x_i^{(n)}, x_l^{(n)}) \approx n^{1-a_{i,l}}$ for $(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j} \in \mathcal{M}_j$. In Lemma 11, we provide the method of the enumeration of points included in a certain subset. Therefore, we obtain Proposition 12 by using Propositions 5 and 7 and complete the desired results with the aid of the upper bound in (ii) of Lemma 13.

The proof of the lower bound in Theorem 2 relies on the moment method used in [9]. Now, we will explain the method of the proof of Proposition 1.1 in [9], which is essentially the same as that in [6, 7, 8, 19]. If we use the Paley-Zygmund inequality for $|\mathcal{L}_n(\alpha)|$, we need to estimate its second moment. However, it is much larger than the square of the first moment and, hence, it is impossible to directly use the moment method for $|\mathcal{L}_n(\alpha)|$. Then, to estimate the lower bound, they considered some set of points called "successful points" which is a slightly smaller set than $\mathcal{L}_n(\alpha)$ (see (4.2) in [9]). In fact, the second moment of the number of this set is of almost the same order as the square of its first moment, and its first moment has same order as that of $|\mathcal{L}_n(\alpha)|$. Then, they used the moment method for successful points, and, hence, the definition of successful points naturally yields the lower bound of $|\mathcal{L}_n(\alpha)|$. In this paper, to show the lower bound in Theorem 2, we only need minor modifications to [9].

In addition, we will discuss two original conceptions in Sections 6 and 7. In Section 6, we will estimate to what extent the probability that a certain geometric structure of multipoints which are late points remain when some spatial element is changed. In Section 7, we will argue the difference between $\mathcal{L}_n(\alpha)$ and $\Psi_n(\alpha)$(or $\mathcal{V}_n(\alpha)$). As mentioned above, from [2, 9] and from our forthcoming paper, it is known that there exist similarities between $\mathcal{L}_n(\alpha)$, $\Psi_n(\alpha)$ and $\mathcal{V}_n(\alpha)$, but there are also differences. We will obtain the complex distribution of pair points.

In the proofs given in the remainder of this paper, we use the letters C or c for various constants.

3 Basic properties

In this section, we collect preliminary results concerning a simple random walk and a finite Markov chain that will are in later sections.

3.1 Hitting probabilities

First, we compute probabilities that a simple random walk in $\mathbb{Z}_n^2$ doesn't hit a multipoint set until a certain random time. Given j distinct points $x_1, x_2, ..., x_j$ of $\mathbb{Z}_n^2$ and a non-empty subset $\tilde{D}$ of $\mathbb{Z}_n^2$ which is disjoint of $\{x_1, ..., x_j\}$, let $\tilde{\tau}$ denote the first time/enters $\tilde{D}$ and define for $1 \leq i, l \leq j$ and $y \notin \{x_1, ..., x_j\}$,

$$Q_{i,l} := \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} P^{x_i}(S_m = x_l, m < \tilde{\tau} \wedge T_y).$$

By decomposing the probability $P^{x_i}(T_y = \tilde{\tau} \wedge T_y)$ by means of the last time the walk leaves the set $\{x_1, ..., x_j\}$ before $\tilde{\tau} \wedge T_y$ we obtain

$$P^{x_i}(T_y = \tilde{\tau} \wedge T_y) = \sum_{l=1}^{j} Q_{i,l} P^{x_l}(T_y = T_{x_1,...,x_j} \wedge \tilde{\tau} \wedge T_y),$$

for $1 \leq i \leq j$. The matrix $Q = (Q_{i,l})_{1 \leq i,l \leq j}$ is regarded as the Green kernel for the Markov chain on $\{x_1, ..., x_j\}$ with the substochastic transition matrix $q = (q_{i,l})_{1 \leq i,l \leq j}$ given by

$$q_{i,l} = P^{x_i}(T_{x_l} = T_{x_1,...,x_j} < t\tilde{a}u \wedge T_y),$$

so that $qQ = Q - E$, where E denotes the unit matrix. Accordingly, Q is regular and

$$Q^{-1} := E - q. \tag{3.3}$$

For any regular matrix A, let $\chi(A)$ (or χA) be the summation over all the elements of A^{-1}. Note that for $1 \leq u \leq j$,

$$P^{x_u}(T_y = T_{x_1,...,x_j} \wedge \tilde{\tau} \wedge T_y) = P^{x_u}(T_y = \tilde{\tau} \wedge T_y) \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{j} (\text{cofactor of } Q_{u,i})}{\det((Q_{i,l})_{1 \leq i,l \leq j})}. \tag{3.4}$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\min_{1 \leq u \leq j} P^{x_u}(T_y = \tilde{\tau} \wedge T_y) \chi((Q_{i,l})_{1 \leq i,l \leq j}) \\ \leq &\sum_{l=1}^{j} P^{x_l}(T_y = T_{x_1,...,x_j} \wedge \tilde{\tau} \wedge T_y) \\ \leq &\max_{1 \leq u \leq j} P^{x_u}(T_y = \tilde{\tau} \wedge T_y) \chi((Q_{i,l})_{1 \leq i,l \leq j}). \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

In particular, we consider the summation of (3.4) and (3.5) over $y \in \tilde{D}$. Note that $\sum_{y \in \tilde{D}} P^{x_u}(T_y = \tilde{\tau} \wedge T_y) = 1$ holds for any $1 \leq u \leq j$. Then, if we let

$$W_{i,l} := \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} P^{x_i}(S_m = x_l, m < \tilde{\tau}),$$

we have for $1 \leq l \leq j$,

$$P^{x_l}(\tilde{\tau} < T_{x_1,...,x_j}) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{j} (\text{cofactor of } W_{l,i})}{\det((W_{i,l})_{1 \leq i,l \leq j})}, \tag{3.6}$$

$$\sum_{l=1}^{j} P^{x_l}(\tilde{\tau} < T_{x_1,...,x_j}) = \chi((W_{i,l})_{1 \leq i,l \leq j}). \tag{3.7}$$

In addition, we consider the case that $j = 2$, the definition of $(\tilde{Q}_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}$ yields that for $i \neq l \in \{1, 2\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} P^{x_i}(T_{x_i} = T_{x_1,x_2} \wedge \tilde{\tau}) =& 1 - \frac{W_{l,l}}{W_{1,1}W_{2,2} - W_{1,2}W_{2,1}}, \\ P^{x_i}(T_{x_l} = T_{x_1,x_2} \wedge \tilde{\tau}) =& \frac{W_{l,i}}{W_{1,1}W_{2,2} - W_{1,2}W_{2,1}}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

Next, we introduce estimates of the hitting probabilities for a simple random walk in $\mathbb{Z}^2$ since we need only estimates for "$\mathbb{Z}^2$" in this paper. By Exercise 1.6.8 of [16] or (4.1) and (4.3) in [19], we have that, uniformly in $0 < r < |x| < R$,

$$\begin{aligned} P^x(T_0 < \tau_R) &= \frac{\log(R/|x|) + O(|x|^{-1})}{\log R}(1 + O((\log|x|)^{-1})), \\ P^x(\tau_r < \tau_R) &= \frac{\log(R/|x|) + O(r^{-1})}{\log(R/r)}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

For x, $y \in D(0, n)$ let $G_n(x, y) := \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} P^x(S_m = y, m < \tau_n)$. In addition, by Proposition 1.6.7 in [16] or (2.1) in [19], we have that for any $x \in D(0, n)$

$$\begin{aligned} G_n(x, 0) &= \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} P^x(S_m = 0, m < \tau_n) = \frac{2}{\pi}\log\left(\frac{n}{|x|}\right) + O(|x|^{-1} + n^{-1}), \\ G_n(0, 0) &= \frac{2}{\pi}\log n + O(1). \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

Therefore, we have that for $x, y \in D(0, n/3)$

$$G_n(x, y) = \frac{2}{\pi}\log\left(\frac{n}{d(x, y)}\right) + O(d(x, y)^{-1} + n^{-1} + 1). \tag{3.11}$$

Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} G_n(x, y) \le& \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} P^{x-y}(S_m = 0, m < \tau_{4n/3}) \\ =& \frac{2}{\pi}\log\left(\frac{n}{d(x, y)}\right) + O(d(x, y)^{-1} + n^{-1} + 1), \\ G_n(x, y) \ge& \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} P^{x-y}(S_m = 0, m < \tau_{2n/3}) \\ =& \frac{2}{\pi}\log\left(\frac{n}{d(x, y)}\right) + O(d(x, y)^{-1} + n^{-1} + 1). \end{aligned}$$

In addition, by (3.10) the strong Markov property yields

$$P(\tau_n < T_0) = (\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} P(S_m = 0, m < \tau_n))^{-1} = \frac{\pi}{2\log n}(1 + o(1)). \tag{3.12}$$

3.2 Probabilities conditioned by the local time

Now, we give some expression of the probability of events associated with a Markov chain. It will be used when considering transitions of the random walk in $\mathbb{Z}_n^2$ from a given set to another one. Consider the general Markov chain $\{X_m\}_{m=0}^{\infty}$ of discrete time on the state space $\mathbb{Z}$ such that $P^4(T_3 < \infty) = 1$. Let us extend the definition of $K(n, x)$ as follows: for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $i, l \in \mathbb{Z}$, set $K(n, e_{i,l}) := \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} 1_{\{X_m=i, X_{m+1}=l\}}$

and in addition $\mathcal{Q}(n, e_{i,l}) := \inf\{m > 0 : K(m, e_{i,l}) = n\}$. Let $\tilde{T}_2 := \inf\{m > T_1 : X_m = 2\}$ and $d_{i,l}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} d_{1,1} :=& P^2(T_1 < T_4, \tilde{T}_2 < T_0), \quad d_{1,2} := P^2(T_4 < T_1), \\ d_{2,1} :=& P^3(T_1 < T_4, \tilde{T}_2 < T_0), \quad d_{2,2} := P^3(T_4 < T_1). \end{aligned}$$

We claim that for any n_1, $n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &P^2(K(\mathcal{Q}(n_2, e_{3,4}), e_{1,2}) = n_1, \mathcal{Q}(n_2, e_{3,4}) < T_0) \\ &= \sum_{0 \le i \le n_1 \wedge (n_2 - 1)} d_{1,1}^{n_1 - i} d_{1,2}^{i+1} \frac{n_1!}{(n_1 - i)! i!} d_{2,1}^{i} d_{2,2}^{n_2 - i - 1} \frac{(n_2 - 1)!}{(n_2 - i - 1)! i!} \end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &P^3(K(\mathcal{Q}(n_2, e_{3,4}), e_{1,2}) = n_1, \mathcal{Q}(n_2, e_{3,4}) < T_0) \\ &= \sum_{1 \le i \le n_1 \wedge n_2} d_{1,1}^{n_1 - i} d_{1,2}^{i} \frac{(n_1 - 1)!}{(n_1 - i)! (i - 1)!} d_{2,1}^{i} d_{2,2}^{n_2 - i} \frac{n_2!}{(n_2 - i)! i!}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

where $0! = 1$. We will show (3.13) and (3.14) by induction on $n_1 + n_2$. It is trivial that (3.13) and (3.14) hold for $n_1 + n_2 = 2$, that is, $n_1 = n_2 = 1$. Fix $n \ge 2$ and assume that (3.13) and (3.14) hold for any n_1, $n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n_1 + n_2 = n$. First, we will show that (3.13) holds for any $\tilde{n}_1$, $\tilde{n}_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\tilde{n}_1 + \tilde{n}_2 = n + 1$. When $\tilde{n}_2 = 1$,

$$P^2(K(\mathcal{Q}(\tilde{n}_2, e_{3,4}), e_{1,2}) = \tilde{n}_1, \mathcal{Q}(\tilde{n}_2, e_{3,4}) < T_0) = d_{1,1}^{\tilde{n}_1 + \tilde{n}_2 - 1} d_{1,2},$$

and, hence, the claim holds. In addition, the strong Markov property yields that for any $\tilde{n}_2 \ge 2$ and $\tilde{n}_1 \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &P^2(K(\mathcal{Q}(\tilde{n}_2, e_{3,4}), e_{1,2}) = \tilde{n}_1, \mathcal{Q}(\tilde{n}_2, e_{3,4}) < T_0) \\ =& d_{1,1} P^2(K(\mathcal{Q}(\tilde{n}_2, e_{3,4}), e_{1,2}) = \tilde{n}_1 - 1, \mathcal{Q}(\tilde{n}_2, e_{3,4}) < T_0) \\ &+ d_{1,2} P^3(K(\mathcal{Q}(\tilde{n}_2 - 1, e_{3,4}), e_{1,2}) = \tilde{n}_1, \mathcal{Q}(\tilde{n}_2 - 1, e_{3,4}) < T_0) \\ =& d_{1,1} \sum_{0 \le i \le (\tilde{n}_1 - 1) \wedge (\tilde{n}_2 - 1)} d_{1,1}^{\tilde{n}_1 - 1 - i} d_{1,2}^{i+1} \frac{(\tilde{n}_1 - 1)!}{(\tilde{n}_1 - 1 - i)! i!} d_{2,1}^{i} d_{2,2}^{\tilde{n}_2 - i - 1} \frac{(\tilde{n}_2 - 1)!}{(\tilde{n}_2 - 1 - i)! i!} \\ &+ d_{1,2} \sum_{1 \le i \le \tilde{n}_1 \wedge (\tilde{n}_2 - 1)} d_{1,1}^{\tilde{n}_1 - i} d_{1,2}^{i} \frac{(\tilde{n}_1 - 1)!}{(\tilde{n}_1 - i)! (i - 1)!} d_{2,1}^{i} d_{2,2}^{\tilde{n}_2 - 1 - i} \frac{(\tilde{n}_2 - 1)!}{(\tilde{n}_2 - 1 - i)! i!} \\ =& \sum_{0 \le i \le \tilde{n}_1 \wedge (\tilde{n}_2 - 1)} d_{1,1}^{\tilde{n}_1 - i} d_{1,2}^{i+1} \frac{\tilde{n}_1!}{(\tilde{n}_1 - i)! i!} d_{2,1}^{i} d_{2,2}^{\tilde{n}_2 - i - 1} \frac{(\tilde{n}_2 - 1)!}{(\tilde{n}_2 - i - 1)! i!}. \end{aligned}$$

The second equality comes from the assumption and the fact that $P^4(T_3 < \infty) = 1$. Therefore, we obtain (3.13). In addition, the same argument yields the corresponding result for (3.14), and, hence, we obtain the desired result.

In addition, we introduce a similar estimate as follows. Let $g_{i,l}$ be the transition probability of $\{X_m\}_{m=0}^{\infty}$. Then, the same argument as above yields

$$\begin{aligned} &P^1\Big(\sum_{m=1}^{n_1 + n_2} 1_{\{X_m = 1\}} = n_1, \sum_{m=1}^{n_1 + n_2} 1_{\{X_m = 2\}} = n_2, X_{n_1 + n_2} = 2 \Big) \\ &= \sum_{0 \le i \le n_1 \wedge (n_2 - 1)} g_{1,1}^{n_1 - i} g_{1,2}^{i+1} \frac{n_1!}{(n_1 - i)! i!} g_{2,1}^{i} g_{2,2}^{n_2 - i - 1} \frac{(n_2 - 1)!}{(n_2 - i - 1)! i!} \end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

and

$$P^2\Big(\sum_{m=1}^{n_1+n_2} 1_{\{X_m=1\}} = n_1, \sum_{m=1}^{n_1+n_2} 1_{\{X_m=2\}} = n_2, X_{n_1+n_2} = 2\Big)$$
$$= \sum_{1\le i\le n_1\wedge n_2} g_{1,1}^{n_1-i} g_{1,2}^{i} \frac{(n_1-1)!}{(n_1-i)!(i-1)!} g_{2,1}^{i} g_{2,2}^{n_2-i} \frac{n_2!}{(n_2-i)!i!}. \tag{3.16}$$

3.3 Matrix's argument

Our argument in later is independent of the arrangement of the elements included in $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{N}$. Then, we consider $(a_{i,l})_{i,l\in\Lambda}$ as the matrix for some arrangement. Given $\eta > 0$ and for $j \in \mathbb{N}$ let

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}_j =& \mathcal{M}_j(\eta)\\
:=& \{(a_{i,l})_{i,l\in\Lambda} : |\Lambda| = j, \Lambda \subset \mathbb{N}, \text{ symmetric,}\\
& \text{for any } 1 \le i,l,p \le j \text{ with } i\neq l, l\neq p, p\neq i, a_{i,i} = 1, 0 \le a_{i,l} \le 1-\eta,\\
& a_{i,l} < a_{i,p} \Rightarrow a_{l,p} = a_{i,l} \text{ and } a_{i,l} = a_{i,p} \Rightarrow a_{l,p} \ge a_{i,l}\},\\
\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_1 =& \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_1(\eta) := \{(a_{i,i})_{i\in\Lambda} : |\Lambda| = 1, \Lambda \subset \mathbb{N}, a_{i,i} = 1\}
\end{aligned}$$

and for $j \ge 2$

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_j =& \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_j(\eta)\\
:=& \{(a_{i,l})_{i,l\in\Lambda} : |\Lambda| = j, \Lambda \subset \mathbb{N}, \text{ symmetric,}\\
& \text{for any } 1 \le i \neq l \le j, a_{i,i} = 1, 0 \le a_{i,l} \le 1-\eta,\\
& \exists G, H \subset \mathbb{N}, g, h \in \mathbb{N} \text{ s.t. } |G| = g, |H| = h, G\cup H = \Lambda, g+h = j,\\
& (a_{i,l})_{i,l\in G} \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_g, (a_{i,l})_{i,l\in H} \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_h, \text{ for any } i \in G, l \in H, a_{i,l} = \min_{i,l\in\Lambda} a_{i,l}\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Proposition 3. *It holds that $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_j = \mathcal{M}_j$ for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. To prove that $\mathcal{M}_j \subset \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_j$, we show the result by induction on $j \in \mathbb{N}$. If $j = 1$, it is trivial that the claim holds. We assume that the claim holds for $1, ..., j-1$ and show the claim for j. Consider any $(a_{i,l})_{i,l\in\Lambda} \in \mathcal{M}_j$ and $s := \min_{i,l\in\Lambda} a_{i,l}$. Pick $u \in \Lambda$ and set $\tilde{\Lambda} := \Lambda \cap \{u\}^c$. Note that $(a_{i,l})_{i,l\in\tilde{\Lambda}} \in \mathcal{M}_{j-1}$, and, hence, $(a_{i,l})_{i,l\in\tilde{\Lambda}} \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_{j-1}$ holds under assumption. Then, set $\tilde{s} = \min_{i,l\in\tilde{\Lambda}} a_{i,l}$, $\tilde{g}$, $\tilde{h}$ with $\tilde{g}+\tilde{h} = j-1$ and $\tilde{G}$, $\tilde{H}$ which is satisfied with the conditions of $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_{j-1}$. We will show $(a_{i,l})_{i,l\in\Lambda} \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_j$. It is trivial that all the condition of $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_j$ except for last two conditions holds. Then, we will set G, H, g, $h \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $|G| = g$, $|H| = h$, $G \cup H = \Lambda$, $g + h = j$ and observe that this division is satisfied with the condition of $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_j$. It is trivial that $(a_{i,l})_{i,l\in G} \in \mathcal{M}_g$ and $(a_{i,l})_{i,l\in H} \in \mathcal{M}_h$ yield $(a_{i,l})_{i,l\in G} \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_g$ and $(a_{i,l})_{i,l\in H} \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_h$ under assumption. Hence, it suffices to show that $a_{i,l} = s$ for any $i \in G$, $l \in H$.

(i) Case: $s = \tilde{s}$

First, we consider the case that there exists $m \in \tilde{\Lambda}$ such that $a_{m,u} > s$.

If $a_{m,u} > s$ for some $m \in \tilde{G}$, we should set $G = \tilde{G} \cup \{u\}$, $H = \tilde{H}$, $g = \tilde{g} + 1$, $h = \tilde{h}$. Then for any $l \in H$, $a_{m,l} = \tilde{s} = s < a_{m,u}$ holds and, hence, the definition of $\mathcal{M}_j$ yields that $a_{l,u} = s$ for any $l \in H$. Therefore, $a_{i,l} = s$ for any $i \in G$, $l \in H$.

If $a_{m,u} > s$ for some $m \in \tilde{H}$, the same argument as above yields $a_{i,l} = s$ for any $i \in H$, $l \in G$ where $G = \tilde{G}$, $H = \tilde{H} \cup \{u\}$, $g = \tilde{g}$ and $h = \tilde{h} + 1$.

Second, we consider the case that for any $m \in \tilde{\Lambda}$, $a_{m,u} = s$. Then, we should set $g = \tilde{g} + \tilde{h}$, $h = 1$, $G = \tilde{G} \cup \tilde{H}$ and $H = \{u\}$. Then, we obtain for any $l \in G$, $a_{l,u} = s$.

(ii) Case: $s \neq \tilde{s}$

We should set $g = \tilde{g} + \tilde{h}$, $h = 1$, $G = \tilde{G} \cup \tilde{H}$ and $H = \{u\}$. Note that there exists $m \in G$ such that $a_{m,u} = s$. Then, since $a_{m,u} < a_{m,l}$ for any $l \in G$, the definition of $\mathcal{M}_j$ yields that $a_{u,l} = s$. Therefore, we obtain $\mathcal{M}_j \subset \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_j$.

Next, we will prove $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_j \subset \mathcal{M}_j$. If $j = 1$ or 2, it is trivial that the claim holds. For $j \geq 3$, we consider any $(a_{i,l})_{i,l\in\Lambda} \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_j$. It is trivial that $(a_{i,l})_{i,l\in\{u_1,u_2,u_3\}} \in \tilde{\mathcal{M}}_3$ holds for any $\{u_1, u_2, u_3\} \subset \Lambda$. Then, it suffices to prove the case that $j = 3$. Consider the case that $G = \{u_1, u_2\}$, $H = \{u_3\}$ and observe the conditions (i) $a_{i,l} < a_{i,p} \Rightarrow a_{l,p} = a_{i,l}$ and (ii) $a_{i,l} = a_{i,p} \Rightarrow a_{l,p} \geq a_{i,l}$.

1. $(i, l, p) = (u_1, u_2, u_3)$: (i) The assumption $a_{u_1,u_2} < a_{u_1,u_3}$ contradicts the condition of $a_{u_1,u_3} = \min_{i,l\in\{u_1,u_2,u_3\}} a_{i,l}$.
   (ii) If $a_{u_1,u_2} = a_{u_1,u_3}$ holds, the fact that $a_{u_2,u_3} = a_{u_1,u_3}$ yields the result.
2. $(i, l, p) = (u_2, u_1, u_3)$: The proof is same as above by the symmetry of u_1 and u_2.
3. $(i, l, p) = (u_3, u_1, u_2)$: (i) The assumption $a_{u_3,u_1} < a_{u_3,u_2}$ contradicts the condition of $a_{u_3,u_1} = a_{u_3,u_2}$.
   (ii) The result is trivial since $a_{u_1,u_3} = \min_{i,l\in\{u_1,u_2,u_3\}} a_{i,l}$ yields $a_{u_1,u_2} \geq a_{u_3,u_1}$.
4. $(i, l, p) = (u_3, u_2, u_1)$: The proof is same as above by the symmetry of u_1 and u_2.
5. $(i, l, p) = (u_2, u_3, u_1)$: (i) (ii) The condition of $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_3$ yields $a_{u_3,u_1} = a_{u_2,u_3}$ and hence the results holds in any case.
6. $(i, l, p) = (u_1, u_3, u_2)$: The proof is same as above by the symmetry of u_1 and u_2.

Therefore, the symmetry of u_1, u_2 and u_3 yields the desired result. □

Remark 1. *Now, we explain why we set $\mathcal{M}_j$. We will show that*

$$\left(\frac{\pi G_n(x_i, x_l)}{2\log n}\right)_{1\leq i,l\leq j}$$

for $x_i \in D(0, n/3)$ with $1 \leq i \leq j$ is asymptotically close to some element in $\mathcal{M}_j$ in some way later. All the conditions in the definition of $\mathcal{M}_j$ except for last two conditions are imaginable. Hence, we will observe that $(G_n(x_i, x_l))_{1\leq i,l\leq j}$ for $x_i \in D(0, n/3)$ with $1 \leq i \leq j$ has the property which asymptotically is close to last two conditions of $\mathcal{M}_j$. Consider some sequence $\{x_k^{(n)}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ with $x_k^{(n)} \in D(0, n/3)$ for $k \in \{i, l, p\}$ such that $d(x_i^{(n)}, x_l^{(n)}) = n^{\beta+o(1)}$ and $d(x_i^{(n)}, x_p^{(n)}) = n^{\beta-\epsilon+o(1)}$ with $0 < \epsilon < \beta$. Then, (3.11) yields that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{2(1-\beta)+o(1)}{\pi}\log n =& G_n(x_i^{(n)}, x_l^{(n)}) \\ <& G_n(x_i^{(n)}, x_p^{(n)}) = \frac{2(1-\beta+\epsilon)+o(1)}{\pi}\log n\end{aligned}$$

for all sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In addition, it is trivial that $d(x_l^{(n)}, x_p^{(n)}) = n^{\beta+o(1)}$ and, hence,

$$\frac{2(1-\beta)+o(1)}{\pi}\log n = G_n(x_l^{(n)}, x_p^{(n)}) \sim G_n(x_i^{(n)}, x_l^{(n)}),$$

where $a_n \sim b_n$ means $a_n/b_n \to 1$ as $n \to \infty$ for any sequence. This fact corresponds to "$a_{i,l} < a_{i,p} \Rightarrow a_{l,p} = a_{i,l}$" in the definition of $\mathcal{M}_j$. To observe other condition in the definition of $\mathcal{M}_j$, consider some sequence $\{x_k^{(n)}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ with $x_k^{(n)} \in D(0, n/3)$ for $k \in \{i, l, p\}$ such that $d(x_i^{(n)}, x_l^{(n)}) = n^{\beta+o(1)}$ and $d(x_i^{(n)}, x_p^{(n)}) = n^{\beta+o(1)}$. Then, (3.11) yields that

$$G_n(x_i^{(n)}, x_l^{(n)}) = \frac{2(1-\beta)+o(1)}{\pi}\log n, G_n(x_i^{(n)}, x_p^{(n)}) = \frac{2(1-\beta)+o(1)}{\pi}\log n.$$

In addition, it is trivial that $d(x_l^{(n)}, x_p^{(n)}) \leq n^{\beta+o(1)}$ holds and, hence,

$$G_n(x_l^{(n)}, x_p^{(n)}) \geq \frac{2(1-\beta)+o(1)}{\pi}\log n \sim G_n(x_i^{(n)}, x_l^{(n)}).$$

This fact corresponds to "$a_{i,l} = a_{i,p} \Rightarrow a_{l,p} \geq a_{i,l}$" in the definition of $\mathcal{M}_j$.

Hereafter, in Subsections 3.3 and 3.4, fix $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and if we mention no thing, we consider $(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j} \in \mathcal{M}_j$ as the represented element of $\mathcal{M}_j$ and its division $G = \{1, ..., g\}$, $H = \{g+1, ..., g+h(=j)\}$ as above. In addition, let $s = \min_{1\le i,l\le j} a_{i,l}$.

Proposition 4. *Any element included in $\mathcal{M}_j$ is regular matrix. In other words, for any $(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j} \in \mathcal{M}_j$, there exists a unique solution $y_1, ..., y_j$ such that*

$$(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}(y_1, ..., y_j)^T = (1, ..., 1)^T.$$

Proof. We will show the claim and in addition the following conditions (A) and (B): when $j = 2$,

$$(A) \quad 1 - s\sum_{i=1}^{j} y_i > 0,$$
$$(B) \quad y_i > 0 \text{ for any } 1 \le i \le j.$$

When $j = 1$, we change (A) to $1 - y_1 \ge 0$. We will show the results by induction on $j \in \mathbb{N}$. It is trivial that the claim holds for $j = 1$ since $y_1 = 1$. Assume that the claim, (A) and (B) hold for $1, ..., j-1$. We will show that the claim, (A) and (B) hold for j. The assumption yields that $(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le g} \in \mathcal{M}_g$ determines a unique solution $(z_1, ..., z_g)^T$ such that $(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le g}(z_1, ..., z_g)^T = (1, ..., 1)^T$ and $(a_{i,l})_{g+1\le i,l\le j} \in \mathcal{M}_h$ determines a unique solution $(z'_1, ..., z'_h)^T$ such that $(a_{i,l})_{g+1\le i,l\le j}(z'_1, ..., z'_h)^T = (1, ..., 1)^T$. In addition, the assumption of (B) yields $z_i > 0$ for any $1 \le i \le g$ and $z'_i > 0$ for any $1 \le i \le h$. Therefore, it holds that $z_i + s\sum_{1\le l\le g, l\ne i} z_l \le 1$ for any $1 \le i \le g$ and $z_i + s\sum_{1\le l\le h, l\ne i} z'_l \le 1$ for any $1 \le i \le h$, and, hence,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{g} z_i \le \frac{g}{1+(g-1)s}, \quad \sum_{i=1}^{h} z'_i \le \frac{h}{1+(h-1)s}.$$

Then, there exists $c > 0$ such that

$$1 - s^2 \sum_{i=1}^{g} z_i \sum_{i=1}^{h} z'_i \ge c. \tag{3.17}$$

It comes from $s \le 1 - \eta$. If we set

$$y_l = \frac{(1 - s\sum_{i=1}^{h} z'_i) z_l}{1 - s^2 \sum_{i=1}^{g} z_i \sum_{i=1}^{h} z'_i} \quad \text{for any } 1 \le l \le g,$$
$$y_l = \frac{(1 - s\sum_{i=1}^{g} z_i) z'_{l-g}}{1 - s^2 \sum_{i=1}^{g} z_i \sum_{i=1}^{h} z'_i} \quad \text{for any } g+1 \le l \le j,$$

it is the solution such that $(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}(y_1, ..., y_j)^T = (1, ..., 1)^T$. Hence, we have proved the existence of the solution. Hereafter, we will observe the properties of $y_1, ..., y_j$ under assuming the existence.

First, we will show (B). By Proposition 3, it holds that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{g} (a_{l,i} y_i) + s \sum_{i=g+1}^{j} y_i = 1 \quad \text{for any } 1 \le l \le g, \tag{3.18}$$
$$s\sum_{i=1}^{g} y_i + \sum_{i=g+1}^{j} (a_{l,i} y_i) = 1 \quad \text{for any } g+1 \le l \le j. \tag{3.19}$$

Hence, by the definition of $z_1, ..., z_g$, $z'_1, ..., z'_h$, we obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^{g} y_i = \left(1 - s\sum_{i=g+1}^{j} y_i\right) \sum_{i=1}^{g} z_i, \quad \sum_{i=g+1}^{j} y_i = \left(1 - s\sum_{i=1}^{g} y_i\right) \sum_{i=1}^{h} z'_i.$$

Then, the simple computation and (3.17) yield

$$\sum_{i=1}^{g} y_i = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{g} z_i - s\sum_{i=1}^{g} z_i \sum_{i=1}^{h} z'_i}{1 - s^2 \sum_{i=1}^{g} z_i \sum_{i=1}^{h} z'_i},$$
$$\sum_{i=g+1}^{j} y_i = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{h} z'_i - s\sum_{i=1}^{g} z'_i \sum_{i=1}^{g} z_i}{1 - s^2 \sum_{i=1}^{g} z_i \sum_{i=1}^{h} z'_i}, \tag{3.20}$$

and, hence,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{j} y_i = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{g} z_i + \sum_{i=1}^{h} z'_i - 2s\sum_{i=1}^{g} z_i \sum_{i=1}^{h} z'_i}{1 - s^2 \sum_{i=1}^{g} z_i \sum_{i=1}^{h} z'_i}. \tag{3.21}$$

Now, if we let $\tilde{s} = \min_{1\le i,l\le g} a_{i,l}$, under assumption of (A) we have that for $g \ge 2$,

$$1 - \tilde{s}\sum_{i=1}^{g} z_i > 0. \tag{3.22}$$

Since $\tilde{s} \ge s$ for $g \ge 2$, (3.20) and (3.22) yield

$$1 - s\sum_{i=1}^{g} y_i = \frac{1 - s\sum_{i=1}^{g} z_i}{1 - s^2 \sum_{i=1}^{g} z_i \sum_{i=1}^{h} z'_i} \ge \frac{1 - \tilde{s}\sum_{i=1}^{g} z_i}{1 - s^2 \sum_{i=1}^{g} z_i \sum_{i=1}^{h} z'_i} > 0.$$

In addition, since $\tilde{s} > s$ for $g = 1$, (3.20) and (3.22) yield

$$1 - sy_1 = \frac{1 - sz_1}{1 - s^2 z_1 \sum_{i=1}^{h} z'_i} > \frac{1 - \tilde{s}z_1}{1 - s^2 z_1 \sum_{i=1}^{h} z'_i} \ge 0.$$

By the definition of $y_{g+1}, ..., y_j$, $z'_1, ..., z'_h$ and (3.19), we have $(y_{g+1}, ..., y_j) = (1 - s\sum_{i=1}^{g} y_i)(z'_1, ...z'_h)$. Then, since we assume the solution $z'_1, ..., z'_h$ is satisfied with $z'_i > 0$ for any $1 \le i \le h$, it holds that any solution $y_{g+1}, ..., y_j$ is satisfied with $y_i > 0$ for any $g + 1 \le i \le j$. In addition, by the same argument as above, the definition of $y_1, ..., y_g$, $z_1, ..., z_g$ and (3.18) yield $y_i > 0$ for any $1 \le i \le g$, and, hence, (B) holds.

Second, we will show (A). The fact that $y_i > 0$ for any $1 \le i \le j$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{j} a_{l,i} y_i = 1$ for any $1 \le l \le j$ yields $s\sum_{i=1}^{j} y_i < 1$ and hence we obtain the desired result.

Now, we turn to prove uniqueness of the solution by using the result of (B) we have already obtained. In general, it is known that

$$V := \{(y_1, ..., y_j) : (a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}(y_1, ..., y_j)^T = (1, ..., 1)^T\} = x_0 + \mathrm{Ker}A,$$

where x_0 is a characteristic solution for $(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}(y_1, ..., y_j)^T = (1, ..., 1)^T$. By the result of (B), it holds that $\{v = (v_1, ..., v_j)^T : v_j > 0\} \supset V$. Since V is a linear space, that $\mathrm{Ker}(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j} \ne \{0\}$ contradicts it. Then $\mathrm{Ker}(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j} = \{0\}$ and, hence, we have the desired claim. □

Recall that $\chi(A)$ is the summation over all the elements of A^{-1}. Note that if we consider $(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}$ and $(y_1, ..., y_j)$ such that

$$(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}(y_1, ..., y_j)^T = (1, ..., 1)^T,$$

$\chi((a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}) = \sum_{i=1}^{j} y_i$ holds.

Proposition 5. *For any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for any $(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j} \in \mathcal{M}_j$, $(\tilde{a}_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}$ with $\max_{1\le i,l\le j} |a_{i,l} - \tilde{a}_{i,l}| \le \delta$ the following hold: $(\tilde{a}_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}$ is regular matrix and*

$$\left|\chi((a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}) - \chi((\tilde{a}_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j})\right| \le \epsilon.$$

Remark 2. *It is trivial that Proposition 5 yields the following: for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(a_{i,l})_{1\leq i,l\leq j} \in \mathcal{M}_j$, $(\tilde{a}_{i,l})_{1\leq i,l\leq j}$ with $\max_{1\leq i,l\leq j} |a_{i,l}n - \tilde{a}_{i,l}| \leq \delta n$ the following holds: $(\tilde{a}_{i,l})_{1\leq i,l\leq j}$ is regular matrix and*

$$\left| \frac{\chi((a_{i,l})_{1\leq i,l\leq j})}{n} - \chi((\tilde{a}_{i,l})_{1\leq i,l\leq j}) \right| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{n}.$$

Proof. First, we will prove that $\mathcal{M}_j$ is the closed set for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$. We consider $\max_{1\leq i,l\leq j} |a_{i,l} - a'_{i,l}|$ for $(a_{i,l})_{1\leq i,l\leq j}$, $(a'_{i,l})_{1\leq i,l\leq j} \in \mathcal{M}_j$ as the metric on $\mathcal{M}_j$. Consider $(a^m_{i,l})_{1\leq i,l\leq j} \in \mathcal{M}_j$ and $(a^\infty_{i,l})_{1\leq i,l\leq j}$ such that $(a^m_{i,l})_{1\leq i,l\leq j} \to (a^\infty_{i,l})_{1\leq i,l\leq j}$ as $m \to \infty$. Set for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $m_k := \inf\{m > m_{k-1} : a^m_{i,l} > a^m_{i,p}\}$ with $m_1 = 1$ and $\inf \emptyset = 0$. First, we assume that $a^\infty_{i,l} < a^\infty_{i,p}$ holds for some $1 \leq i, l, p \leq j$ with $i \neq l, l \neq p, p \neq i$. Then, $\sup m_k < \infty$ and hence by the definition of $\mathcal{M}_j$ there exists $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $m \geq m_0$, $a^m_{l,p} = a^m_{i,l}$. Therefore, $a^\infty_{l,p} = a^\infty_{i,l}$ holds.

Next, we assume that $a^\infty_{i,l} = a^\infty_{i,p}$ holds for some $1 \leq i, l, p \leq j$ with $i \neq l, l \neq p, p \neq i$. If $\sup m_k < \infty$, by the definition of $\mathcal{M}_j$ there exists $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $m \geq m_0$, $a^m_{l,p} \geq a^m_{i,l}$, and, hence, $a^\infty_{l,p} \geq a^\infty_{i,l}$. If $\sup m_k = \infty$, by the definition of $\mathcal{M}_j$ we obtain $a^\infty_{l,p} = a^\infty_{i,p}$, and, hence, the assumption of $a^\infty_{i,l} = a^\infty_{i,p}$ yields $a^\infty_{l,p} = a^\infty_{i,l}$. Therefore, $\mathcal{M}_j$ is the closed set and hence compact.

Now, we turn to prove the desired result. Note that

$$\max_{1\leq i,l\leq j} |a_{i,l}| \leq 1. \tag{3.23}$$

In addition, Proposition 4 yields that $\det(a_{i,l})_{1\leq i,l\leq j} \neq 0$ holds for $(a_{i,l})_{1\leq i,l\leq j} \in \mathcal{M}_j$. Then, by compactness of $\mathcal{M}_j$, we have $\inf_{(a_{i,l})_{1\leq i,l\leq j}\in\mathcal{M}_j} |\det(a_{i,l})_{1\leq i,l\leq j}| \neq 0$. Hence, (3.23) yields that there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for any $\delta_{i,l}$ with $|\delta_{i,l}| \leq \delta$,

$$\inf_{(a_{i,l})_{1\leq i,l\leq j}\in\mathcal{M}_j} |\det(a_{i,l} + \delta_{i,l})_{1\leq i,l\leq j}| \neq 0. \tag{3.24}$$

Therefore, the first claim holds. Finally, it is trivial that (3.23) and (3.24) again yield the second claim, and, hence, we obtain the desired result. □

Remark 3. *By the same argument as Remark 2, (3.23) and (3.24) yield the following: for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(a_{i,l})_{1\leq i,l\leq j} \in \mathcal{M}_j$, $(\tilde{a}_{i,l})_{1\leq i,l\leq j}$ with $\max_{1\leq i,l\leq j} |a_{i,l}n - \tilde{a}_{i,l}| \leq \delta n$, it holds that for any $1 \leq i \leq j$*

$$|y_i - \tilde{y}_i| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{n}, \tag{3.25}$$

where

$$y_i := \frac{\sum_{i=1}^j (\textit{cofactor of } a_{l,i}n)}{\textit{det}((a_{i,l}n)_{1\leq i,l\leq j})}, \quad \tilde{y}_i := \frac{\sum_{i=1}^j (\textit{cofactor of } \tilde{a}_{l,i})}{\textit{det}((\tilde{a}_{i,l})_{1\leq i,l\leq j})}.$$

In addition, (B) in Proposition 4 and compactness of $\mathcal{M}_j$ yield that there exists $c > 0$ such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(a_{i,l})_{1\leq i,l\leq j} \in \mathcal{M}_j$

$$y_i > \frac{c}{n}. \tag{3.26}$$

Therefore, (3.25) and (3.26) yield that there exist $\delta > 0$ and $c > 0$ such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(a_{i,l})_{1\leq i,l\leq j} \in \mathcal{M}_j$, $(\tilde{a}_{i,l})_{1\leq i,l\leq j}$ with $\max_{1\leq i,l\leq j} |a_{i,l}n - \tilde{a}_{i,l}| \leq \delta n$, it holds that for any $1 \leq i \leq j$

$$\tilde{y}_i > \frac{c}{n}. \tag{3.27}$$

We write $(a_{i,l})_{i,l\in\Lambda}$ which is satisfied with conditions of $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_j$ as

$$M\{(a_{i,l})_{i,l\in G}, (a_{i,l})_{i,l\in H}, s\}.$$

However, we conveniently use the following meaning of this symbol. If we write

$$(a_{i,l})_{1\leq i,l\leq j} = M\{(b_{i,l})_{1\leq i,l\leq g}, (\hat{b}_{i,l})_{1\leq i,l\leq h}, s\}$$

for $g+h=j$ and $(a_{i,l})_{1\leq i,l\leq j}\in\mathcal{M}_j$, we consider the case that

$$\begin{cases} a_{i,l} = \min_{1\leq i,l\leq j} a_{i,l} = s & \text{for } 1\leq i\leq g, g+1\leq l\leq j, \\ a_{i,l} = b_{i,l} & \text{for } 1\leq i,l\leq g, \\ a_{i,l} = \hat{b}_{i-g,l-g} & \text{for } g+1\leq i,l\leq j. \end{cases}$$

To divide $\mathcal{M}_j$, we define $\Xi : \cup_{j\in\mathbb{N}}\mathcal{M}_j \to R$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in\Lambda}) :=& \Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in G}) + \Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in H}) + 1 - s, \\ \Xi((a_{i,i})_{i\in\Lambda}) :=& 0 \quad \text{for any } \Lambda \text{ with } |\Lambda| = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 6. *Ξ is independent of the division we select, and hence Ξ is well defined.*

Proof. We simply write this proof by induction on $j\in\mathbb{N}$. It is trivial that the claim holds for $j=1$. We assume that the claim holds for $1,...,j-1$ and show the claim for j. Assume that there exist two different divisions G, H and $\tilde{G}$, $\tilde{H}$ which are satisfied with conditions of $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_j$. If we consider the case that $H\cap\tilde{H}\neq\emptyset$, $H\cap\tilde{G}\neq\emptyset$, $G\cap\tilde{H}\neq\emptyset$ and $G\cap\tilde{G}\neq\emptyset$, it holds that

$$\min_{i,l\in G} a_{i,l} = \min_{i,l\in H} a_{i,l} = \min_{i,l\in\tilde{G}} a_{i,l} = \min_{i,l\in\tilde{H}} a_{i,l} = s$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (a_{i,l})_{i,l\in G} &= M\{(a_{i,l})_{i,l\in G\cap\tilde{G}}, (a_{i,l})_{i,l\in G\cap\tilde{H}}, s\}, \\ (a_{i,l})_{i,l\in H} &= M\{(a_{i,l})_{i,l\in H\cap\tilde{G}}, (a_{i,l})_{i,l\in H\cap\tilde{H}}, s\}, \\ (a_{i,l})_{i,l\in\tilde{G}} &= M\{(a_{i,l})_{i,l\in\tilde{G}\cap G}, (a_{i,l})_{i,l\in\tilde{G}\cap H}, s\}, \\ (a_{i,l})_{i,l\in\tilde{H}} &= M\{(a_{i,l})_{i,l\in\tilde{H}\cap G}, (a_{i,l})_{i,l\in\tilde{H}\cap H}, s\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in G}) + \Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in H}) \\ =&\Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in G\cap\tilde{G}}) + \Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in G\cap\tilde{H}}) \\ +&\Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in H\cap\tilde{G}}) + \Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in H\cap\tilde{H}}) + 2(1-s), \\ &\Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in\tilde{G}}) + \Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in\tilde{H}}) \\ =&\Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in\tilde{G}\cap G}) + \Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in\tilde{G}\cap H}) \\ +&\Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in\tilde{H}\cap G}) + \Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in\tilde{H}\cap H}) + 2(1-s), \end{aligned}$$

and, hence, $\Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in G})+\Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in H}) = \Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in\tilde{G}})+\Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in\tilde{H}})$ holds. In addition, if we consider the case that $H\cap\tilde{H}=\emptyset$, it holds that

$$\min_{i,l\in G} a_{i,l} = \min_{i,l\in\tilde{G}} a_{i,l} = s,$$

and

$$(a_{i,l})_{i,l\in G} = M\{(a_{i,l})_{i,l\in G\cap\tilde{G}}, (a_{i,l})_{i,l\in G\cap\tilde{H}}, s\},$$
$$(a_{i,l})_{i,l\in\tilde{G}} = M\{(a_{i,l})_{i,l\in\tilde{G}\cap G}, (a_{i,l})_{i,l\in\tilde{G}\cap H}, s\}.$$

Hence, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in G}) + \Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in H})\\
=&\Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in G\cap\tilde{H}}) + \Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in G\cap\tilde{G}}) + \Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in H}) + 1 - s\\
=&\Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in\tilde{H}}) + \Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in G\cap\tilde{G}}) + \Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in H}) + 1 - s,\\
&\Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in\tilde{G}}) + \Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in\tilde{H}})\\
=&\Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in\tilde{G}\cap G}) + \Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in\tilde{G}\cap H}) + \Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in\tilde{H}}) + 1 - s\\
=&\Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in\tilde{G}\cap G}) + \Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in H}) + \Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in\tilde{H}}) + 1 - s,
\end{aligned}$$

and, hence, $\Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in G}) + \Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in H}) = \Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in\tilde{G}}) + \Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in\tilde{H}})$ holds. Since the same proof as second case holds for each case that $H\cap\tilde{G} = \emptyset$, $G\cap\tilde{H} = \emptyset$, or $G\cap\tilde{G} = \emptyset$, the desired result holds. □

Then, let

$$\mathcal{G}_r := \{(a_{i,l})_{i,l\in\Lambda} \in \mathcal{M}_j : \Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in\Lambda}) = r\}$$

and for $j\in\mathbb{N}$ and $r\le 1-\eta$, $A_r^{(j)} := (a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}$ which is satisfied with $(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}\in\mathcal{M}_j$ and $a_{i,l} = r$ for $1\le i\ne l\le j$. Note that $A_r^{(1)}$ is independent of r. We sometimes write it as $A^{(1)}$. Next, we will observe the additional property of the matrix included in $\mathcal{M}_j$.

Proposition 7. *For any $r\le j-1$*

$$\min_{(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}\in\mathcal{G}_r} \chi((a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}) = \chi(A^{(j)}_{1-r/(j-1)}) = \frac{j}{j-r}.$$

To show Proposition 7, we use the following two lemmas.

Lemma 8. *Consider any $(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}$, $(\overline{a}_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}\in\mathcal{M}_j$ with $(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j} = M\{(a_{i,l})_{i,l\in G}, (a_{i,l})_{i,l\in H}, s\}$, $(\overline{a}_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j} = M\{(\overline{a}_{i,l})_{i,l\in G}, (\overline{a}_{i,l})_{i,l\in H}, s\}$. Then, if*

$$\chi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in G}) \ge \chi((\overline{a}_{i,l})_{i,l\in G}) \text{ and } \chi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in H}) \ge \chi((\overline{a}_{i,l})_{i,l\in H}),$$

it holds that

$$\chi((a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}) \ge \chi((\overline{a}_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}).$$

Proof. Note that it suffices to prove the case that $(a_{i,l})_{i,l\in G} = (\overline{a}_{i,l})_{i,l\in G}$ since we can prove the claim by repeating the same proof. Let

$$g(t,b,c) := \frac{b+c-2tbc}{1-t^2bc},$$

where $1-t^2bc>0$. Then g is monotonically increasing in c since the simple computation yields

$$\frac{\partial g}{\partial c} = \frac{(1-tb)^2}{(1-t^2bc)^2} \ge 0.$$

Note that (3.21) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\chi((a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}) =& \frac{\chi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in G}) + \chi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in H}) - 2s\chi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in G})\chi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in H})}{1-s^2\chi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in G})\chi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in H})}\\
=& g(s, \chi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in G}), \chi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in H})).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $g(t,b,c)$ is monotonically increasing in c, the assumption yields the desired result. □

Lemma 9. *Consider $r \leq j-1$, $0 \leq \gamma \leq \gamma_1 \leq \gamma_2 \leq 1$ with $r = (g-1)(1-\gamma_2)+(h-1)(1-\gamma_1)+1-\gamma$ and $M\{A^{(g)}_{\gamma_2}, A^{(h)}_{\gamma_1}, \gamma\}$, which is satisfied with $r = \Xi(M\{A^{(g)}_{\gamma_2}, A^{(h)}_{\gamma_1}, \gamma\})$. Then, fixing the values γ_2 and r, $\chi(M\{A^{(g)}_{\gamma_2}, A^{(h)}_{\gamma_1}, \gamma\})$ is minimized at $\gamma = \gamma_1$.*

Proof. Fix the values γ_2 and r. Note that $r = \Xi(M\{A^{(g)}_{\gamma_2}, A^{(h)}_{\gamma_1}, \gamma\}) = (g-1)(1-\gamma_2)+(h-1)(1-\gamma_1)+1-\gamma$ is constant and hence $(g-1)\gamma_2+(h-1)\gamma_1+\gamma$ is. Then, if we set $p = (g-1)\gamma_2+1$ and $q = (h-1)\gamma_1+\gamma+1$, p and q are constants. In addition,

$$\chi(A^{(g)}_{\gamma_2}) = \frac{g}{(g-1)\gamma_2+1}, \quad \chi(A^{(h)}_{\gamma_1}) = \frac{h}{(h-1)\gamma_1+1}.$$

Then by (3.21) it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} f(\gamma) :=& \chi(M\{A^{(g)}_{\gamma_2}, A^{(h)}_{\gamma_1}, \gamma\}) \\ =& \frac{\chi(A^{(g)}_{\gamma_2}) + \chi(A^{(h)}_{\gamma_1}) - 2\gamma\chi(A^{(g)}_{\gamma_2})\chi(A^{(h)}_{\gamma_1})}{1-\gamma^2\chi(A^{(g)}_{\gamma_2})\chi(A^{(h)}_{\gamma_1})} \\ =& \frac{g((h-1)\gamma_1+1)+h((g-1)\gamma_2+1)-2\gamma gh}{((g-1)\gamma_2+1)((h-1)\gamma_1+1)-\gamma^2 gh} \\ =& \frac{g(q-\gamma)+hp-2\gamma gh}{(q-\gamma)p-\gamma^2 gh}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that we consider $0 \leq \gamma \leq (q-1)/h$ and show that f is monotonically decreasing in $0 \leq \gamma \leq (q-1)/h$. The simple computation yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial f(\gamma)}{\partial \gamma} =& \frac{((q-\gamma)p-\gamma^2 gh)(-g-2gh)-(g(q-\gamma)+hp-2\gamma gh)(-p-2\gamma gh)}{((q-\gamma)p-\gamma^2 gh)^2} \\ =& \frac{-g^2h(1+2h)(\gamma-\frac{gq+hp}{g+2gh})^2+\frac{h(gq+hp)^2}{(1+2h)}-2qpgh+hp^2}{((q-\gamma)p-\gamma^2 gh)^2} \end{aligned}$$

and set

$$\tilde{f} := -g^2h(1+2h)(\gamma-\frac{gq+hp}{g+2gh})^2+\frac{h(gq+hp)^2}{(1+2h)}-2qpgh+hp^2. \tag{3.28}$$

Note that it holds that

$$\frac{q-1}{h} \leq \text{the apex (summit) of } \tilde{f} = \frac{(gq+hp)}{g(1+2h)}. \tag{3.29}$$

Because we can compute

$$\begin{aligned} h(gq+hp)-(q-1)g(1+2h) =& h^2p+g(h+1)+gh-gq(h+1) \\ =& h^2p-g(h+1)(q-1)+gh \\ \geq& h^2((g-1)\gamma_2+1)-g(h+1)h\gamma_2+gh \\ =& h(g+h)(1-\gamma_2) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality come from $-(q-1) \geq -((h-1)\gamma_2+\gamma_2) = -h\gamma_2$ and second one $\gamma_2 \leq 1$. Therefore, we obtain (3.29). In addition, we claim

$$\tilde{f}\left(\frac{q-1}{h}\right) \leq 0. \tag{3.30}$$

Because we can compute

$$\begin{aligned} h\tilde{f}\left(\frac{q-1}{h}\right) =& -g(g+2gh)(q-1)^2+2gh(gq+hp)(q-1)+h^2p(p-2gq) \\ =& -g^2(q-1)^2-2g^2h(q-1)^2+2g^2h(q-1)^2 \\ &+2g^2h(q-1)+2gh^2p(q-1)+h^2p(p-2gq) \\ =& -g^2(q-1)^2+2g^2h(q-1)-2gh^2p+h^2p^2 \\ =& -(ph-g(q-1))(2gh-g(q-1)-hp)\leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

The inequality comes from $ph-g(q-1)\geq gh\gamma_2\geq 0$ and $2gh-g(q-1)-hp\geq 2gh-gh-hp\geq 0$. Therefore, by (3.28), (3.29) and (3.30), we have that for $0\leq\gamma\leq(q-1)/h$, $\tilde{f}(\gamma)\leq 0$. Then, we obtain the desired result. □

Proof of Proposition 7. It is trivial that $\chi(A^{(j)}_{1-r/(j-1)})=j/(j-r)$ holds, and, hence, we will show only $\min_{(a_{i,l})_{1\leq i,l\leq j}\in\mathcal{G}_r}\chi((a_{i,l})_{1\leq i,l\leq j})=\chi(A^{(j)}_{1-r/(j-1)})$. We will prove by induction on $j\in\mathbb{N}$. If $j=1$ or 2, it is obvious that the claim holds. Assume that the claim holds for $1,2,...,j-1$ and show the claim for j. If we show the case that $g\wedge h=1$, Lemma 9 yields the desired result. Only the case that $j\geq 4$ and g, $h\geq 2$ is remained since $g\wedge h=1$ holds for $j=3$.

For any $r\leq j-1$, consider some $(a_{i,l})_{1\leq i,l\leq j}\in\mathcal{G}_r$. For $(a_{i,l})_{1\leq i,l\leq j}=M\{(a_{i,l})_{i,l\in G},(a_{i,l})_{i,l\in H},s\}$, we pick $M\{A^{(g)}_{\gamma_2},A^{(h)}_{\gamma_1},\gamma\}$ which is satisfied with $\gamma=s$, $\Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in G})=\Xi(A^{(g)}_{\gamma_2})=(g-1)(1-\gamma_2)$ and $\Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in H})=\Xi(A^{(h)}_{\gamma_1})=(h-1)(1-\gamma_1)$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $\gamma_1\leq\gamma_2$. Note that $M\{A^{(g)}_{\gamma_2},A^{(h)}_{\gamma_1},\gamma\}\in\mathcal{G}_r$. By Lemma 8 and the assumption, we obtain

$$\chi(M\{A^{(g)}_{\gamma_2},A^{(h)}_{\gamma_1},\gamma\})\leq\chi((a_{i,l})_{1\leq i,l\leq j}). \tag{3.31}$$

In addition, consider $M\{A^{(g)}_{\gamma_2},A^{(h)}_{\tilde{\gamma}_1},\tilde{\gamma}_1\}$, which is satisfied with $(h-1)\gamma_1+\gamma=h\tilde{\gamma}_1$. Note that $M\{A^{(g)}_{\gamma_2},A^{(h)}_{\tilde{\gamma}_1},\tilde{\gamma}_1\}\in\mathcal{G}_r$. By Lemma 9, we obtain

$$\chi(M\{A^{(g)}_{\gamma_2},A^{(h)}_{\tilde{\gamma}_1},\tilde{\gamma}_1\})\leq\chi(M\{A^{(g)}_{\gamma_2},A^{(h)}_{\gamma_1},\gamma\}). \tag{3.32}$$

Next, we consider $M\{A^{(j-1)}_{\tilde{\gamma}_2},A^{(1)},\tilde{\gamma}_1\}$, which is satisfied with $(g-1)\gamma_2+h\tilde{\gamma}_1=(j-2)\tilde{\gamma}_2+\tilde{\gamma}_1$. Note that $M\{A^{(j-1)}_{\tilde{\gamma}_2},A^{(1)},\tilde{\gamma}_1\}\in\mathcal{G}_r$. In addition,

$$M\{A^{(g)}_{\gamma_2},A^{(h)}_{\tilde{\gamma}_1},\tilde{\gamma}_1\}=M\{M\{A^{(g)}_{\gamma_2},A^{(h-1)}_{\tilde{\gamma}_1},\tilde{\gamma}_1\},A^{(1)},\tilde{\gamma}_1\},$$

since $\gamma_2\geq\tilde{\gamma}_1$ holds. Then, by Lemma 8 and the assumption, we obtain

$$\chi(M\{A^{(j-1)}_{\tilde{\gamma}_2},A^{(1)},\tilde{\gamma}_1\})\leq\chi(M\{A^{(g)}_{\gamma_2},A^{(h)}_{\tilde{\gamma}_1},\tilde{\gamma}_1\}). \tag{3.33}$$

Finally, Lemma 9 yields

$$\chi(A^{(j)}_{1-r/(j-1)})\leq\chi(M\{A^{(j-1)}_{\tilde{\gamma}_2},A^{(1)},\tilde{\gamma}_1\}). \tag{3.34}$$

Note that $A^{(j)}_{1-r/(j-1)}\in\mathcal{G}_r$. Therefore, by (3.31), (3.32), (3.33) and (3.34) we obtain the desired result. □

Remark 4. *We write the example of above matrices. Consider the case that $j=5$, $g=3$, $h=2$ and*

some $(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le 5}=M\{(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le 3},(a_{i,l})_{i,l\in\{4,5\}},s\}$. *Then, (3.31), (3.32), (3.33) and (3.34) imply*

$$\begin{aligned}\chi\begin{pmatrix}1&a_{1,2}&a_{1,3}&s&s\\a_{2,1}&1&a_{2,3}&s&s\\a_{3,1}&a_{3,2}&1&s&s\\s&s&s&1&a_{4,5}\\s&s&s&a_{5,4}&1\end{pmatrix}\ge&\chi\begin{pmatrix}1&\gamma_2&\gamma_2&\gamma&\gamma\\\gamma_2&1&\gamma_2&\gamma&\gamma\\\gamma_2&\gamma_2&1&\gamma&\gamma\\\gamma&\gamma&\gamma&1&\gamma_1\\\gamma&\gamma&\gamma&\gamma_1&1\end{pmatrix}\ge\chi\begin{pmatrix}1&\gamma_2&\gamma_2&\tilde\gamma_1&\tilde\gamma_1\\\gamma_2&1&\gamma_2&\tilde\gamma_1&\tilde\gamma_1\\\gamma_2&\gamma_2&1&\tilde\gamma_1&\tilde\gamma_1\\\tilde\gamma_1&\tilde\gamma_1&\tilde\gamma_1&1&\tilde\gamma_1\\\tilde\gamma_1&\tilde\gamma_1&\tilde\gamma_1&\tilde\gamma_1&1\end{pmatrix}\\\ge&\chi\begin{pmatrix}1&\tilde\gamma_2&\tilde\gamma_2&\tilde\gamma_2&\tilde\gamma_1\\\tilde\gamma_2&1&\tilde\gamma_2&\tilde\gamma_2&\tilde\gamma_1\\\tilde\gamma_2&\tilde\gamma_2&1&\tilde\gamma_2&\tilde\gamma_1\\\tilde\gamma_2&\tilde\gamma_2&\tilde\gamma_2&1&\tilde\gamma_1\\\tilde\gamma_1&\tilde\gamma_1&\tilde\gamma_1&\tilde\gamma_1&1\end{pmatrix}\ge\chi\begin{pmatrix}1&\tilde\gamma&\tilde\gamma&\tilde\gamma&\tilde\gamma\\\tilde\gamma&1&\tilde\gamma&\tilde\gamma&\tilde\gamma\\\tilde\gamma&\tilde\gamma&1&\tilde\gamma&\tilde\gamma\\\tilde\gamma&\tilde\gamma&\tilde\gamma&1&\tilde\gamma\\\tilde\gamma&\tilde\gamma&\tilde\gamma&\tilde\gamma&1\end{pmatrix},\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde\gamma:=1-r/(j-1)$.

3.4 Preliminary for main results

In this subsection, our goal is to show Proposition 12, which is used in the upper bound in Theorems 1 and 2. We will estimate this by using matrix's arguments in Subsection 3.3. To show this, we prepare additional notations. Given real valued $j\times j$ matrices $(m_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}$, $(m'_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}$, let

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{E}[(m_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j},(m'_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}]\\=&\mathcal{E}[(m_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j},(m'_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}](j,n)\\:=&\{(x_1,...,x_j)\in(\mathbb{Z}_n^2)^j:m_{i,l}\le d(x_i,x_l)\le m'_{i,l}\text{ for any }1\le i\ne l\le j\}.\end{aligned}$$

Note that this set is independent of diagonal element of matrix. When $m_{i,l}$ for $1\le i,l\le j$ is constant and $m'_{i,l}$ be, we simply write $\mathcal{E}[(m_{i,l}),(m'_{i,l})]$. Fix $0<\beta<1$. For $0<\eta<1$ with $\eta\le(1-\beta)\wedge\beta$, let

$$\mathcal{M}_j^{\beta,\eta}:=\mathcal{M}_j\cap\mathcal{E}[(1-\beta),(1-\eta)]$$

and for $(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}\in\mathcal{M}_j^{\beta,\eta}$ and $\delta'>0$ let

$$\begin{aligned}&\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\delta'}[(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}]=\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\delta'}[(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}](j,n)\\:=&\mathcal{E}\left[(\frac{1}{2^j}n^{1-a_{i,l}})_{1\le i,l\le j},(2^jn^{1-a_{i,l}+\delta'})_{1\le i,l\le j}\right],\\&\mathcal{H}^{\delta'}=\mathcal{H}^{\delta'}(j,n):=\{\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\delta'}[(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}](j,n):(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}\in\mathcal{M}_j^{\beta,\eta}\}.\end{aligned}$$

To show Proposition 12, we use the following two lemmas.

Lemma 10. *For any* $0<\delta',\eta<1$ *with* $\eta\le(1-\beta)\wedge\beta$ *there exists* $n_0\in\mathbb{N}$ *such that for any* $n\ge n_0$ *and* $(x_1,...,x_j)\in\mathcal{E}[(n^\eta),(n^\beta)]$ *there exists* $V\in\mathcal{H}^{\delta'}(j,n)$ *such that* $(x_1,...,x_j)\in V$ *holds.*

Proof. We will show by induction on $j\in\mathbb{N}$. It is obvious that the claim holds for $j=1,2$. Assume that the claim holds for $j-1$ and consider any $(x_1,...,x_j)\in\mathcal{E}[(n^\eta),(n^\beta)]$. Put $1\le i_0,l_0\le j$ such that $d(x_{i_0},x_{l_0})=\min_{1\le i\ne l\le j}d(x_i,x_l)$. Then, by the assumption, for $(x_1,...,x_{l_0-1},x_{l_0+1},...,x_j)\in\mathcal{E}[(n^\eta),(n^\beta)](j-1,n)$ there exists

$$(a_{i,l})_{i,l\in\{1,...,l_0-1,l_0+1,...,j\}}\in\mathcal{M}_{j-1}^{\beta,\eta}\tag{3.35}$$

such that for any $i,l\in\{1,...,l_0-1,l_0+1,...,j\}$

$$\frac{1}{2^{j-1}}n^{1-a_{i,l}}\le d(x_i,x_l)\le 2^{j-1}n^{1-a_{i,l}+\delta'}.$$

Set $(\tilde{a}_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}$ as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{a}_{i,l} &= \tilde{a}_{l,i} = a_{i,l} \quad \text{for any } 1 \le i, l \ne l_0 \le j, \\ \tilde{a}_{l_0,l} &= \tilde{a}_{l,l_0} = a_{i_0,l} \quad \text{for any } 1 \le l \ne i_0, l_0 \le j, \\ \tilde{a}_{l_0,i_0} &= \tilde{a}_{i_0,l_0} = (1-\eta) \wedge \left(\left(\frac{(j-1)\log 2 - \log d(x_{i_0}, x_{l_0})}{\log n} + 1 + \delta' \right) \vee (1-\beta) \right), \\ \tilde{a}_{l_0,l_0} &= 1. \end{cases}$$

In addition, $\tilde{a}_{i_0,l_0} = \max_{1\le i\ne l\le j} \tilde{a}_{i,l}$ holds since $\hat{g}(s) := \max\{b \in [1-\beta, 1-\eta] : 2^{-j+1} n^{1-b} \le s \le 2^{j-1} n^{1-b+\delta'}\}$ is monotonically decreasing and $\hat{g}(d(x_{i_0}, x_{l_0})) = \tilde{a}_{i_0,l_0}$ and $\hat{g}(d(x_i, x_l)) \ge \tilde{a}_{i,l}$ hold for any $1 \le i \ne l \le j$.

Now, we will prove that $(\tilde{a}_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j} \in \mathcal{M}_j^{\beta,\eta}$ as follows. It is obvious that the definition of $(\tilde{a}_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}$ yields that $(\tilde{a}_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}$ is symmetric and $(\tilde{a}_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j} \in \mathcal{E}[(1-\beta), (1-\eta)]$. Then, we will prove that for any $1 \le i, l, p \le j$ with $i \ne l, l \ne p, p \ne i$, (i) $\tilde{a}_{i,l} < \tilde{a}_{i,p} \Rightarrow \tilde{a}_{l,p} = \tilde{a}_{i,l}$ and (ii) $\tilde{a}_{i,l} = \tilde{a}_{i,p} \Rightarrow \tilde{a}_{l,p} \ge \tilde{a}_{i,l}$ as follows:

1. $i, l, p \ne l_0$: (3.35) yields $(\tilde{a}_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j} \in \mathcal{M}_j$. Hence, we obtain (i) and (ii).
2. $i = l_0$ and $p, l \ne i_0$: (i) If $\tilde{a}_{l_0,l} < \tilde{a}_{l_0,p}$, $a_{i_0,l} < a_{i_0,p}$ holds. Therefore, (3.35) yields $\tilde{a}_{l,p} = a_{l,p} = a_{i_0,l} = \tilde{a}_{l_0,l}$ holds. (ii) The proof is almost same as (i).
3. ($p = l_0$ and $i, l \ne i_0$) or ($l = l_0$ and $l, i \ne i_0$) : The proof is almost same as above.

Then since $(\tilde{a}_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}$ is symmetric for l_0 and i_0, it is remained to prove (i) and (ii) for the following cases.

1. $i = l_0$, $l = i_0$: (i) The assumption contradicts. (ii) Since $\tilde{a}_{l_0,p} = \tilde{a}_{i_0,p}$, $\tilde{a}_{l_0,i_0} = \tilde{a}_{l_0,p}$ yields the result.
2. $i = l_0$, $p = i_0$: (i) The result is trivial. (ii) The proof is almost same as above.
3. $l = l_0$, $p = i_0$: (i) The assumption contradicts. (ii) The result is trivial.

Therefore, we obtain $(\tilde{a}_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j} \in \mathcal{M}_j^{\beta,\eta}$. In addition, we will prove $(x_1, ..., x_j) \in \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\delta'}[(\tilde{a}_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}]$. Note that the triangle inequality yields that for any $1 \le l \le j$ with $l \ne i_0, l_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_{l_0}, x_l) \le& d(x_{l_0}, x_{i_0}) + d(x_{i_0}, x_l) \\ \le& 2^{j-1} n^{1-\tilde{a}_{i_0,l_0}+\delta'} + 2^{j-1} n^{1-a_{i_0,l}+\delta'} \le 2^j n^{1-\tilde{a}_{l_0,l}+\delta'}, \end{aligned}$$

and since $d(x_{l_0}, x_l) + d(x_{l_0}, x_{i_0}) \ge d(x_{i_0}, x_l)$ and $d(x_{l_0}, x_l) \ge d(x_{l_0}, x_{i_0})$,

$$d(x_{l_0}, x_l) \ge \frac{1}{2} d(x_{i_0}, x_l) \ge \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2^{j-1}} n^{1-\tilde{a}_{i_0,l}} = \frac{1}{2^j} n^{1-\tilde{a}_{l_0,l}}.$$

Therefore, for any $1 \le i \ne l \le j$

$$\frac{1}{2^j} n^{1-\tilde{a}_{i,l}} \le d(x_i, x_l) \le 2^j n^{1-\tilde{a}_{i,l}+\delta'},$$

and, hence, we obtain the desired result. □

Note that $(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j} \in \mathcal{M}_j^{\beta,\eta}$ is satisfied with $0 < (j-1)\eta \le \Xi((a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}) \le (j-1)\beta$. In addition, to introduce the next lemma, for $0 < t \le (j-1)\beta$ and $\delta' > 0$ set

$$\mathcal{H}_t^{\delta'} := \{\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\delta'}[(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}](j,n) : (a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j} \in \mathcal{M}_j^{\beta,\eta}, \Xi((a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}) = t\}.$$

Lemma 11. *For any $\epsilon > 0$ there exist $\delta_0 > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that for any $0 < t \le (j-1)\beta$, $0 < \delta' < \delta_0$, $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\delta'}[(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}](j,n) \in \mathcal{H}_t^{\delta'}$ and any $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$|\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\delta'}[(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}]| \le Cn^{2t+2+\epsilon/2}.$$

Proof. To prove the claim, for $0 < t \le (j-1)\beta$, $\delta' > 0$, $x \in \mathbb{Z}_n^2$ and $|\Lambda| = 1$ set

$$D_x^{\delta'}((a_{i,i})_{i\in\Lambda}) := \emptyset,$$

and for $j \ge 2$ and $m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$

$$\begin{aligned} &D_x^{\delta'}((a_{i,l})_{m\le i,l\le m+j}) \\ :=&\{(x_2,...,x_j) \in \mathcal{E}[(0),(Ln^{1-a_{i,l}+\delta'})_{m+2\le i,l\le m+j}](j-1,n) : \\ &d(x,x_l) \le Ln^{1-a_{m+1,l}+\delta'} \text{ for any } m+2 \le l \le m+j\}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.36}$$

and in addition

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{t,M,x}^{\delta'}(j) := \{D_x^{\delta'}((a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}) : (a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j} \in \mathcal{M}_j^{\beta,\eta}, \Xi((a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}) = t\}.$$

Then, it suffices to prove that for any $\epsilon > 0$ and $L < \infty$ there exist $\delta_0 > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that for any $0 < \delta' < \delta_0$, $x \in \mathbb{Z}_n^2$, $t \le (j-1)\beta$, $(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j} \in \mathcal{M}_j^{\beta,\eta}$ and any $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$|D_x^{\delta'}((a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j})| \le Cn^{2t+\epsilon/2}.$$

We prove this by induction on $j \in \mathbb{N}$. It is obvious that the claim holds for $j = 1, 2$. Assume that the claim holds for $1, 2, ..., j-1$. To show that the claim holds for j, consider $D_{x_1}^{\delta'}((a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}) \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{t,M,x}^{\delta'}(j)$. Set $\Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in G}) = t_1$ and $\Xi((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in H}) = t_2$, and hence $t = \Xi((a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}) = t_1 + t_2 + 1 - s$ holds. In addition, note that if we let $x' := x_1$ and $x'' := x_{g+1}$, it holds that

$$D_{x'}^{\delta'}((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in G}) \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{t_1,M,x'}^{\delta'}(g), \quad D_{x''}^{\delta'}((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in H}) \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{t_2,M,x''}^{\delta'}(h). \tag{3.37}$$

Then, by the assumption we can obtain that there exist $0 < \delta_0 < \epsilon/12$ and $C > 0$ such that for any $x', x'' \in \mathbb{Z}_n^2$, $0 < \delta' < \delta_0$, $t_1 \le (g-1)\beta$, $t_2 \le (h-1)\beta$, $(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j} \in \mathcal{M}_j^{\beta,\eta}$ and any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, it holds that $|D_{x'}^{\delta'}((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in G})| \le Cn^{2t_1+\epsilon/6}$, $|D_{x''}^{\delta'}((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in H})| \le Cn^{2t_2+\epsilon/6}$ and, hence,

$$\begin{aligned} &|D_{x'}^{\delta'}((a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j})| \\ \le &\sum_{x''\in\mathbb{Z}_n^2 : d(x',x'') \le Ln^{1-s+\delta'}} |\{(x',x_2,...,x_g,x'',x_{g+2},...,x_j) : \\ &(x_2,...,x_g) \in D_{x'}^{\delta'}((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in G}), (x_{g+2},...,x_j) \in D_{x''}^{\delta'}((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in H})\}| \\ \le &Cn^{2-2s+2\delta'} |D_{x'}^{\delta'}((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in G})| \times |D_{x''}^{\delta'}((a_{i,l})_{i,l\in H})| \\ \le &Cn^{2t_1+2t_2+2-2s+\epsilon/2} = Cn^{2t+\epsilon/2}. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality comes from $\delta' < \epsilon/12$. Therefore, we can obtain the desired result. □

Remark 5. *The reason why we set "L" in (3.36) instead of "2^j" is to ensure (3.37).*

Note that by Lemma 10, it holds that for any $\delta' > 0$ there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $n \ge n_0$ and $(x_1,...,x_j) \in \mathcal{E}[(n^\eta),(n^\beta)]$

$$\{(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j} \in \mathcal{M}_j^{\beta,\eta} : (x_1,...,x_j) \in \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\delta'}[(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}]\} \ne \emptyset.$$

Then, we can define the function $\tilde{K} : \mathcal{E}[(n^\eta),(n^\beta)] \to \mathbb{R}$ for all sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$ as follows.

$$\tilde{K}(x_1,...,x_j) := \inf\{\chi((b_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}) : (x_1,...,x_j) \in \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\delta'}[(b_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}]\}.$$

To state the following proposition, we prepare notations. Recall $F_{h,\beta}(\gamma) = F(h,\beta,\gamma) = h\gamma^2\beta + (1-\gamma\beta)^2/(1-\beta)$ and let $\gamma(h) := 1/(h(1-\beta)+\beta)$. Note that for any $(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j} \in \mathcal{M}_j^{\beta,\eta}$, $((\beta-1+a_{i,l})/\beta)_{1\le i,l\le j} \in \mathcal{M}_j$ holds. Then, we can define the following: for $(x_1,...,x_j) \in \mathcal{E}[(n^\eta),(n^\beta)]$ with $\tilde{K}(x_1,...,x_j) = \chi((a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j})$ and $(x_1,...,x_j) \in \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\delta'}[(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}]$

$$\tilde{A}_\beta^{(j)} := \left(\frac{\beta-1+a_{i,l}}{\beta}\right)_{1\le i,l\le j}, \quad \gamma_0 := \beta^{-1}(1-\sqrt{\alpha}^{-1}(1-\beta)),$$
$$B_1 = B_{1,\delta'} := F(\chi(\tilde{A}_\beta^{(j)}),\beta,\gamma(\chi(\tilde{A}_\beta^{(j)}))\vee\gamma_0), \quad B_2 = B_{2,\delta'} := \chi((a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}).$$

Note that definitions of $\tilde{A}_\beta^{(j)}$, B_1 and B_2 depend on $(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}$ and hence $(x_1,...,x_j)$.

Proposition 12. *For any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $C > 0$ such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\delta' < \delta_0$*

$$(A) \quad \sum_{(x_1,...,x_j)\in\mathcal{E}[(n^\eta),(n^\beta)]} n^{-2\alpha B_1} \le Cn^{\rho_j(\alpha,\beta)+\epsilon},$$
$$(B) \quad \sum_{(x_1,...,x_j)\in\mathcal{E}[(n^\eta),(n^\beta)]} n^{-2\alpha B_2} \le Cn^{\hat{\rho}_j(\alpha,\beta)+\epsilon}. \tag{3.38}$$

Proof. Note that for any $b \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\chi((a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}) = \frac{\chi((b+a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j})}{1-b\chi((b+a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j})}. \tag{3.39}$$

Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}&\{(y_1,...,y_j) : (a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}(y_1,...,y_j)^T = (1,...,1)^T\}\\ =&\left\{\left(\frac{y_1}{1-b\chi((b+a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j})},...,\frac{y_j}{1-b\chi((b+a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j})}\right) :\right.\\ &\left.(b+a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}(y_1,...,y_j)^T = (1,...,1)^T\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Proposition 7,

$$\min_{(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}\in\mathcal{G}_t} \chi(\tilde{A}_\beta^{(j)}) = \min_{(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}\in\mathcal{G}_t} \frac{\beta\chi((a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j})}{1-\chi((a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j})(1-\beta)} = \frac{j\beta}{j\beta-t},$$

and, hence,

$$\min_{(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}\in\mathcal{G}_t} F(\chi(\tilde{A}_\beta^{(j)}),\beta,\gamma_0) = \frac{1-\beta}{\alpha} + \frac{j}{j\beta-t}(1-\sqrt{\alpha}^{-1}(1-\beta))^2.$$

By (3.39), we have

$$F(\chi(\tilde{A}_\beta^{(j)}),\beta,\gamma(\chi(\tilde{A}_\beta^{(j)}))) = \frac{\chi(\tilde{A}_\beta^{(j)})}{\chi(\tilde{A}_\beta^{(j)})(1-\beta)+\beta} = \chi((a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}). \tag{3.40}$$

Note that Proposition 7 implies $\min_{(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}\in\mathcal{G}_t} \chi((a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}) = j/(j-t)$. Therefore, we obtain

$$\tilde{B}_1(t) := \min_{(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}\in\mathcal{G}_t} B_1 = \begin{cases} \frac{j}{j-t} & \text{if } \gamma(\chi(\tilde{A}_\beta^{(j)})) \ge \gamma_0,\\ \frac{1-\beta}{\alpha} + \frac{j}{j\beta-t}(1-\sqrt{\alpha}^{-1}(1-\beta))^2 & \text{otherwise,}\end{cases}$$
$$\tilde{B}_2(t) := \min_{(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}\in\mathcal{G}_t} B_2 = \frac{j}{j-t}.$$

Consider any $0 < \delta' < \delta_0$ and $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\delta_0 N_0 = \beta - \eta$. Then, by above, for any $\delta' > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $C > 0$ such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the right hand side of (3.38) is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
&N_0^j \max_{0\le t\le (j-1)\beta} \max_{\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\delta'}[(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}]\in\mathcal{H}_t^{\delta'}} \sum_{(x_1,\dots,x_j)\in\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\delta'}[(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}]} n^{-2\alpha B_i}\\
\le& C \max_{0\le t\le (j-1)\beta} n^{2t+2+\epsilon/2} \max_{\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\delta'}[(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}]\in\mathcal{H}_t^{\delta'}} n^{-2\alpha B_i}\\
\le& C \max_{0\le t\le (j-1)\beta} n^{2t+2+\epsilon} n^{-2\alpha \tilde{B}_i(t)},
\end{aligned}$$

for $i = 1, 2$. The first inequality comes from Lemma 11 and the last one comes from Proposition 7. Therefore, since

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{0\le t\le (j-1)\beta} 2t + 2 - 2\alpha\tilde{B}_1(t) &= \rho_j(\alpha,\beta),\\
\max_{0\le t\le (j-1)\beta} 2t + 2 - 2\alpha\tilde{B}_2(t) &= \hat{\rho}_j(\alpha,\beta),
\end{aligned}$$

we obtain the desired result. □

4 Proof of Theorem 2

4.1 Preliminary of the proof of Theorem 2

Fix $0 < \alpha, \beta < 1$. For $k, n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k \le n$, let $n_k := 6\alpha k^2 \log k$, $r_k := (k!)^3$ and $K_n := 4r_n$. Let $\mathcal{R}_n^z$ be the time until completion of the first n_n excursions from $\partial D(z, r_{n-1})$ to $\partial D(z, r_n)$. For $z \in \mathbb{Z}^2_{K_n}$, let $N_{n,k}^z$ denote the number of excursions from $\partial D(z, r_{k-1})$ to $\partial D(z, r_k)$ until time $\mathcal{R}_n^z$. Let

$$I(h,\gamma) := \begin{cases} [0,\gamma^2] & \text{for } \gamma < \gamma_h,\\ [0,\infty] & \text{for } \gamma = \gamma_h,\\ [\gamma^2,\infty] & \text{for } \gamma > \gamma_h. \end{cases}$$

To state the following lemma, we define the domain $\mathbf{Go}^\beta$ such that

$$\mathbf{Go}^\beta := \{(z, x_1, ..., x_j) : z \in \mathbb{Z}^2_{K_n}, x_1, ..., x_j \in D(z, r_{\beta n-2})\}.$$

Lemma 13.
(i) For any $\delta > 0$ there exists $C > 0$ such that for any $z \in \mathbb{Z}^2_{K_n}$

$$P\left(\frac{N_{n,\beta n}^z}{n_{\beta n}} \in I(0,\gamma)\right) \le C K_n^{-2\alpha F_{0,\beta}(\gamma)+\delta}.$$

(ii) For any $\delta > 0$ there exist $\delta_1 > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that for any $\delta' < \delta_1$, $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\delta'}[(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}](j, K_n) \in \mathcal{H}^{\delta'}$, $(x_1, ..., x_j) \in \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\delta'}[(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}](j, K_n)$ and $(z, x_1, ..., x_j) \in \mathbf{Go}^\beta$

$$\begin{aligned}
&C^{-1} K_n^{-2\alpha F(\chi(\tilde{A}_\beta^{(j)}),\beta,\gamma)-\delta}\\
\le& P\left(x_1, ..., x_j \in \mathcal{L}_{K_n}(\alpha), \frac{N_{n,\beta n}^z}{n_{\beta n}} \in I(\chi(\tilde{A}_\beta^{(j)}),\gamma)\right)\\
\le& C K_n^{-2\alpha F(\chi(\tilde{A}_\beta^{(j)}),\beta,\gamma)+\delta}.
\end{aligned}$$

Remark 6. (6.3) *in [9] yields* (*i*) *in Theorem 13.*

Corollary 14. *Recall that* $B_{1,\delta'} = F(\chi(\tilde{A}^{(j)}_\beta), \beta, \gamma(\chi(\tilde{A}^{(j)}_\beta)) \vee \gamma_0)$. *For any* $\delta > 0$ *there exists* δ_1 *and* $C > 0$ *such that for any* $\delta' < \delta_1$, $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\delta'}[(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}](j, K_n) \in \mathcal{H}^{\delta'}$, $(x_1, ..., x_j) \in \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\delta'}[(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}](j, K_n)$ *and* $(z, x_1, ..., x_j) \in \mathbf{Go}^\beta$

$$P\left(x_1, ..., x_j \in \mathcal{L}_{K_n}(\alpha), \frac{N^z_{n,\beta n}}{n_{\beta n}} \le \gamma_0^2\right) \le C K_n^{-2\alpha B_{1,\delta'}+\delta}.$$

Proof. Note that the minimum of $F_{h,\beta}(\gamma)$ is $h/(h(1-\beta)+\beta)$ at $\gamma_h(\beta)$. Then, Lemma 13 and the simple computation yield the desired result. □

To prove (ii) in Lemma 13, we will estimate the following probabilities. For any $z \in \mathbb{Z}^2_{K_n}$ let $\tilde{T}_{\partial D(z,r_{\beta n})} := \inf\{m > T_{\partial D(z,r_{\beta n-1})} : S_m \in \partial D(z, r_{\beta n})\}$ and for any $y \in \partial D(z, r_{\beta n})$ and $y' \in \partial D(z, r_{n-1})$

$$\begin{aligned}
q_{1,1} :&= P^y(T_{\partial D(z,r_{\beta n-1})} < T_{\partial D(z,r_n)}, \tilde{T}_{\partial D(z,r_{\beta n})} < T_{x_1,...,x_j}),\\
q_{1,2} :&= P^y(T_{\partial D(z,r_n)} < T_{\partial D(z,r_{\beta n-1})}),\\
q_{2,2} :&= P^{y'}(T_{\partial D(z,r_n)} < T_{\partial D(z,r_{\beta n-1})}),\\
q_{2,1} :&= P^{y'}(T_{\partial D(z,r_{\beta n-1})} < T_{\partial D(z,r_n)}, \tilde{T}_{\partial D(z,r_{\beta n})} < T_{x_1,...,x_j}).
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 15.

(i) It holds that, uniformly in $0 < \delta' < \delta_2$, $y \in \partial D(z, r_{\beta n})$, $y' \in \partial D(z, r_{n-1})$, $(z, x_1, ..., x_j) \in \mathbf{Go}^\beta$ *with* $(x_1, ..., x_j) \in \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\delta'}[(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}](j, K_n)$

$$q_{1,1} = \left(1 - \frac{1 + o(1_{\delta_2,n})}{(1-\beta)n}\right)\left(1 - \frac{\pi + o(1_{\delta_2,n})}{\beta n}\chi(\tilde{A}^{(j)}_\beta)\right), \tag{4.41}$$

$$q_{1,2} = \frac{1 + o(1_{\delta_2,n})}{(1-\beta)n}, \tag{4.42}$$

$$q_{2,2} = \left(1 - \frac{1 + o(1_{\delta_2,n})}{(1-\beta)n}\right), \tag{4.43}$$

$$q_{2,1} = \frac{1 + o(1_{\delta_2,n})}{(1-\beta)n}\left(1 - \frac{\pi + o(1_{\delta_2,n})}{\beta n}\chi(\tilde{A}^{(j)}_\beta)\right), \tag{4.44}$$

where $d_{\delta_2,n} = o(1_{\delta_2,n})$ *means* $\lim_{\delta_2\to 0}\lim_{n\to\infty} d_{\delta_2,n} \to 0$.

(ii) For any $\delta > 0$ *there exist* $c > 0$ *and* $\delta_2 > 0$ *such that for any* $0 < \delta' < \delta_2$ *and* $(z, x_1, ..., x_j) \in \mathbf{Go}^\beta$ *with* $(x_1, ..., x_j) \in \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\delta'}[(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}](j, K_n)$,

$$P(T_{\partial D(z,r_{\beta n})} < T_{x_1,...,x_j}) \ge c K_n^{-\delta/8}.$$

Proof of (i) in Lemma 15. (3.9) yields that, uniformly in $y \in \partial D(z, r_{\beta n})$ and $y' \in \partial D(z, r_{n-1})$,

$$\begin{aligned}
P^y(T_{\partial D(z,r_{\beta n-1})} < T_{\partial D(z,r_n)}) &= 1 - \frac{1 + o(1)}{(1-\beta)n},\\
P^{y'}(T_{\partial D(z,r_{\beta n-1})} < T_{\partial D(z,r_n)}) &= \frac{1 + o(1)}{(1-\beta)n}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we obtain (4.42) and (4.43). By the strong Markov property, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
q_{1,1} &= E^y[P^{y_0}(T_{\partial D(z,r_{\beta n})} < T_{x_1,...,x_j} | \mathcal{F}(T_{\partial D(z,r_{\beta n-1})}))1_{\{T_{\partial D(z,r_{\beta n-1})} < T_{\partial D(z,r_n)}\}}],\\
q_{2,1} &= E^{y'}[P^{y_0}(T_{\partial D(z,r_{\beta n})} < T_{x_1,...,x_j} | \mathcal{F}(T_{\partial D(z,r_{\beta n-1})}))1_{\{T_{\partial D(z,r_{\beta n-1})} < T_{\partial D(z,r_n)}\}}].
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, it suffices to estimate

$$P^{y_0}(T_{x_1,...,x_j} < T_{\partial D(z,r_{\beta n})}) = \frac{\pi + o(1_{\delta_2,n})}{\beta n}\chi(\tilde{A}^{(j)}_\beta) \tag{4.45}$$

for $y_0 \in \partial D(z, r_{\beta n-1})$ to show (4.41) and (4.44). Note that for $(z, x_1, ..., x_j) \in \mathbf{Go}^\beta$ and $y_0 \in \partial D(z, r_{\beta n-1})$

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} P^{x_i}(S_m = x_l, m < T_{D(z,r_{\beta n})} \wedge T_{y_0}) \leq G_{r_{\beta n}}(x_i - z, x_l - z),$$
$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} P^{x_i}(S_m = x_l, m < T_{D(z,r_{\beta n})} \wedge T_{y_0}) \geq G_{r_{\beta n-1}}(x_i - z, x_l - z).$$

Hence, since $r_{\beta n-1}/r_{\beta n-2} \geq 3$ for all sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$, (3.11) yields

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} P^{x_i}(S_m = x_l, m < T_{D(z,r_{\beta n})} \wedge T_{y_0}) = \frac{2}{\pi}(\log r_{\beta n} - \log d(x_i, x_l)^+ + O(1)),$$

where $(a)^+ = a \vee 1$. Then, (3.9) yields that, uniformly in $(z, x_1, ..., x_j) \in \mathbf{Go}^\beta$,

$$P^{x_i}(T_{y_0} < T_{D(z,r_{\beta n})}) = \frac{1 + o(1)}{\beta n}.$$

Then, for all sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $(x_1, ..., x_j) \in \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\delta'}[(a_{i,l})_{1 \leq i,l \leq j}](j, K_n)$ and $\delta' < \delta_2$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max \left| \frac{2}{\pi}(\log r_{\beta n} - \log d(x_i, x_l)^+ + o(1)) - \frac{\beta - 1 + a_{i,l}}{\beta} \frac{6\beta n \log n}{\pi} \right| \\
\leq &\max \frac{6\beta n \log n}{\pi} \left| \frac{\beta - 1 + b_{i,l}}{\beta} - \frac{\beta - 1 + a_{i,l}}{\beta} \right| = o(1_{\delta_2,n}) n \log n,
\end{aligned}$$

where the above maximum is over $b_{i,l} = a_{i,l} + o(1_{\delta_2,n})$ with $1 \leq i, l \leq j$. Hence, by Remark 2 for all sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$, any $\delta' < \delta_2$ and $(x_1, ..., x_j) \in \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\delta'}[(a_{i,l})_{1 \leq i,l \leq j}](j, K_n)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \chi\left(\left(\frac{2}{\pi}(\log r_{\beta n} - \log d(x_i, x_l)^+ + O(1)) \right)_{1 \leq i,l \leq j} \right) - \frac{\pi}{6\beta n \log n} \chi\left(\tilde{A}_\beta^{(j)} \right) \right| \\
= &\frac{o(1_{\delta_2,n})}{n \log n}. \qquad (4.46)
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if we substitute $T_{D(z,r_{\beta n})}$ and y for $\tilde{\tau}$ and y_0 in (3.5), (3.11) yields

$$\sum_{l=1}^{j} P^{x_l}(T_{y_0} < T_{x_1,...,x_j} \wedge T_{\partial D(z,r_{\beta n})}) = \frac{1 + o(1_{\delta_2,n})}{\beta n} \frac{\pi}{6\beta n \log n} \chi(\tilde{A}_\beta^{(j)}). \qquad (4.47)$$

Note that by (3.12) we obtain

$$P^{y_0}(T_{y_0} < T_{x_1,...,x_j} \wedge T_{\partial D(z,r_{\beta n})}) = 1 - \frac{\pi + o(1_{\delta_2,n})}{6\beta n \log n}.$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
&P^{y_0}(T_{x_1,...,x_j} < T_{\partial D(z,r_{\beta n})}) \\
= &\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} P^{y_0}(T_{y_0} < T_{x_1,...,x_j} \wedge T_{\partial D(z,r_{\beta n})})^i P^{y_0}(T_{x_l} = T_{y_0} \wedge T_{x_1,...,x_j} \wedge T_{\partial D(z,r_{\beta n})}) \\
= &\frac{1}{1 - P^{y_0}(T_{y_0} < T_{x_1,...,x_j} \wedge T_{\partial D(z,r_{\beta n})})} P^{y_0}(T_{x_1,...,x_j} < T_{y_0} \wedge T_{\partial D(z,r_{\beta n})}) \\
= &\frac{6(1 + o(1_{\delta_2,n}))\beta n \log n}{\pi} P^{y_0}(T_{x_1,...,x_j} < T_{y_0} \wedge T_{\partial D(z,r_{\beta n})}) \\
= &\frac{6(1 + o(1_{\delta_2,n}))\beta n \log n}{\pi} \sum_{l=1}^{j} P^{x_l}(T_{y_0} < T_{x_1,...,x_j} \wedge T_{\partial D(z,r_{\beta n})}).
\end{aligned}$$

The last equality comes from the time-reversal of random walk. Therefore, in view of (4.47), (4.45) is completed. □

Proof of (ii) in Lemma 15. If $z \notin D(0, r_{\beta n}) \cup \partial D(0, r_{\beta n})$, $P(T_{\partial D(z, r_{\beta n})} < T_{x_1,...,x_j}) = 1$ holds, and, hence, the result holds.

Next, we consider the case that $z \in D(0, r_{\beta n}) \cup \partial D(0, r_{\beta n})$. Fix $\delta > 0$. First, we will show that there exist $c > 0$ and $\delta_2 > 0$ such that for any $0 < \delta' < \delta_2$, $(z, x_1, ..., x_j) \in \mathbf{Go}^\beta$ with $(x_1, ..., x_j) \in \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\delta'}[(a_{i,l})_{1 \le i,l \le j}](j, K_n)$ and $x_{j+1} \in \cup_{i=1}^{j} \partial D(x_i, 2^{-j-1} K_n{}^\eta)$,

$$P^{x_{j+1}}(T_{\partial D(z, r_{\beta n})} < T_{x_1,...,x_{j+1}}) \ge c K_n^{-\delta/16}. \tag{4.48}$$

For any $\delta' > 0$, consider $(x_1, ..., x_j) \in \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\delta'}[(a_{i,l})_{1 \le i,l \le j}](j, K_n)$. For $1 \le i_0 \le j$, set $(\tilde{b}_{i,l}(i_0))_{1 \le i,l \le j+1} = (\tilde{b}_{i,l})_{1 \le i,l \le j+1}$ as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{b}_{i,l} = \tilde{b}_{l,i} = a_{i,l} \quad \text{for any } 1 \le i, l \le j, \\ \tilde{b}_{j+1,l} = \tilde{b}_{l,j+1} = a_{i_0,l} \quad \text{for any } 1 \le l \ne i_0 \le j, \\ \tilde{b}_{j+1,i_0} = \tilde{b}_{i_0,j+1} = 1 - \eta, \\ \tilde{b}_{j+1,j+1} = 1. \end{cases}$$

We have $(\tilde{b}_{i,l})_{1 \le i,l \le j+1} \in \mathcal{M}_{j+1}^{\beta,\eta}$ with modification of the proof of Lemma 10. In addition, note that for $x_j \in \partial D(x_{i_0}, 2^{-j-1} K_n{}^\eta)$,

$$(x_1, ..., x_{j+1}) \in \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\delta'}[(\tilde{b}_{i,l})_{1 \le i,l \le j+1}](j+1, K_n) \tag{4.49}$$

with modification of the proof of Lemma 10. Since $r_{\beta n}/(r_{\beta_n - 2} + K_n^\eta) \ge 3$ for all sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and small $\eta > 0$, (3.11) yields that for $1 \le i, l \le j+1$

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} P^{x_i}(S_m = x_l, m < T_{D(z, r_{\beta n})}) = \frac{2}{\pi}(\log r_{\beta n} - \log d(x_i, x_l)^+ + O(1)).$$

Then, for all sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(x_1, ..., x_{j+1}) \in \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\delta'}[(\tilde{b}_{i,l})_{1 \le i,l \le j+1}](j+1, K_n)$ with $\delta' < \delta_2$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\max \left| \frac{2}{\pi}(\log r_{\beta n} - \log d(x_i, x_l)^+ + O(1)) - \frac{\beta - 1 + \tilde{b}_{i,l}}{\beta} \frac{6\beta n \log n}{\pi} \right| \\ \le &\max \frac{6\beta n \log n}{\pi} \left| \frac{\beta - 1 + b_{i,l}}{\beta} - \frac{\beta - 1 + \tilde{b}_{i,l}}{\beta} \right| = o(1_{\delta_2, n}) n \log n, \end{aligned}$$

where the above maximum is over $b_{i,l} = \tilde{b}_{i,l} + o(1_{\delta_2,n})$ with $1 \le i, l \le j+1$. Therefore, (3.27) and (3.39) yield that there exists $c > 0$ such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x_j \in \partial D(x_{i_0}, 2^{-j-1} K_n{}^\eta)$,

$$P^{x_{j+1}}(T_{\partial D(z, r_{\beta n})} < T_{x_1,...,x_{j+1}}) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{j+1} (\text{cofactor of } d_{j+1,i})}{\det((d_{i,l})_{1 \le i,l \le j+1})} \ge \frac{c}{n \log n},$$

where $(d_{i,l})_{1 \le i,l \le j+1} := 2/\pi(\log r_{\beta n} - \log d(x_i, x_l)^+ + O(1))_{1 \le i,l \le j+1}$. Therefore, with the aid of the symmetry of $x_1, ..., x_j$ we have (4.48).

Now we turn to the desired result. Note that (3.9) and (3.12) yield that there exists $c > 0$ such that for $(z, x_1, ..., x_j) \in \mathbf{Go}^\beta$

$$P(\min_{1 \le i \le j} T_{\partial D(x_i, 2^{-j-1} K_n{}^\eta)} < T_{x_1,...,x_j}) \ge c K_n^{-\delta/16}.$$

Therefore, with the aid of (4.48) the strong Markov property yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&P(T_{\partial D(z,r_{\beta n})} < T_{x_1,\dots,x_j}) \\
\geq &P(\min_{1\leq i\leq j} T_{\partial D(x_i,2^{-j-1}K_n^{\eta})} < T_{x_1,\dots,x_j}) \\
\times &\min_{x_{j+1}\in \cup_{i=1}^{j}\partial D(x_i,2^{-j-1}K_n^{\eta})} P^{x_{j+1}}(T_{\partial D(z,r_{\beta n})} < T_{x_1,\dots,x_{j+1}}) \geq cK_n^{-\delta/8},
\end{aligned}$$

and, hence, the desired result is completed. □

Proof of (ii) in Lemma 13. For $l \in \{1,2\}$ let

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{q}_{1,l} &:= \max_{y\in\partial D(z,r_{\beta n})} q_{1,l}, \quad \hat{q}_{2,l} := \max_{y'\in\partial D(z,r_{n-1})} q_{2,l}, \\
\tilde{q}_{1,l} &:= \min_{y\in\partial D(z,r_{\beta n})} q_{1,l}, \quad \tilde{q}_{2,l} := \min_{y'\in\partial D(z,r_{n-1})} q_{2,l}.
\end{aligned}$$

For $\delta_2 > 0$, we consider any $(z, x_1, ..., x_j) \in \mathbf{Go}^{\beta}$ with $(x_1, ..., x_j) \in \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\delta'}[(a_{i,l})_{1\leq i,l\leq j}]$ and $0 < \delta' < \delta_2$. First, we will prove the desired upper bound. By the strong Markov property, we obtain that for $c_0 \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned}
&P(T_{x_1,\dots,x_j} > \mathcal{R}_n^z, N_{n,\beta n}^z = c_0) \\
\leq &\max_{y_0\in\partial D(z,r_{\beta n-1})} P^{y_0}(T_{x_1,\dots,x_j} > \mathcal{R}_n^z, N_{n,\beta n}^z = c_0) \\
+ &\max_{y'\in\partial D(z,r_{n-1})} P^{y'}(T_{x_1,\dots,x_j} > \mathcal{R}_n^z, N_{n,\beta n}^z = c_0). \qquad (4.50)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $P^{\tilde{y}}(T_{\partial D(z,r_{n-1})} < \infty) = 1$ for any $\tilde{y} \in \partial D(z, r_n)$. Then, if we substitute $\{x_1, ..., x_j\}$, $\partial D(z, r_{\beta n-1})$, $\partial D(z, r_{\beta n})$, $\partial D(z, r_{n-1})$, $\partial D(z, r_{\beta n-1})$, $c_0 - 1$, n_n into $0, 1, 2, 3, 4, n_1, n_2$ in (3.13),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max_{y_0\in\partial D(z,r_{\beta n-1})} P^{y_0}(T_{x_1,\dots,x_j} > \mathcal{R}_n^z, N_{n,\beta n}^z = c_0) \\
\leq &\max_{y_0\in\partial D(z,r_{\beta n-1})} P^{y_0}(T_{\partial D(z,r_{\beta n})} < T_{x_1,\dots,x_j}) \\
&\times \max_{y\in\partial D(z,r_{\beta n})} P^{y}(T_{x_1,\dots,x_j} > \mathcal{R}_n^z, N_{n,\beta n}^z = c_0 - 1) \\
\leq &\sum_{0\leq i\leq (c_0-1)\wedge(n_n-1)} \hat{q}_{1,1}^{c_0-1-i}\hat{q}_{1,2}^{i+1}\frac{(c_0-1)!}{(c_0-1-i)!i!}\hat{q}_{2,1}^{i}\hat{q}_{2,2}^{n_n-i-1}\frac{(n_n-1)!}{(n_n-i-1)!i!}
\end{aligned}$$

In addition, if we substitute $\{x_1, ..., x_j\}$, $\partial D(z, r_{\beta n-1})$, $\partial D(z, r_{\beta n})$, $\partial D(z, r_{n-1})$, $\partial D(z, r_{\beta n-1})$, c_0, n_n into $0, 1, 2, 3, 4, n_1, n_2$ in (3.14),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max_{y'\in\partial D(z,r_{n-1})} P^{y'}(T_{x_1,\dots,x_j} > \mathcal{R}_n^z, N_{n,\beta n}^z = c_0) \\
\leq &\sum_{1\leq i\leq c_0\wedge n_n} \hat{q}_{1,1}^{c_0-i}\hat{q}_{1,2}^{i}\frac{(c_0-1)!}{(c_0-i)!(i-1)!}\hat{q}_{2,1}^{i}\hat{q}_{2,2}^{n_n-i}\frac{n_n!}{(n_n-i)!i!}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let us denote the probability in the left hand side of (4.50) by A. Then, the above estimate implies

$$\begin{aligned}
A \leq &2((c_0\wedge n_n)+1) \\
&\times \max_{0\leq i\leq c_0\wedge n_n} \hat{q}_{1,1}^{c_0-1-i}\hat{q}_{1,2}^{i}\frac{c_0!}{(c_0-1-i)!(i-1)!}\hat{q}_{2,1}^{i}\hat{q}_{2,2}^{n_n-i}\frac{n_n!}{(n_n-i-1)!i!}.
\end{aligned}$$

With the aid of (ii) in Lemma 15 we will estimate the maximal term. Let us define $h(i)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} h(i) :=& \left(1 - \frac{\pi + o(1_{\delta_2,n})}{\beta n}\chi(\tilde{A}_\beta^{(j)})\right)^{c_0-1}\left(1 - \frac{1+o(1_{\delta_2,n})}{(1-\beta)n}\right)^{c_0-1-i} \\ &\times \left(\frac{1+o(1_{\delta_2,n})}{(1-\beta)n}\right)^i \frac{c_0!}{(c_0-1-i)!(i-1)!} \\ &\times \left(\frac{1+o(1_{\delta_2,n})}{(1-\beta)n}\right)^i \left(1 - \frac{1+o(1_{\delta_2,n})}{(1-\beta)n}\right)^{n_n-i} \frac{n_n!}{(n_n-i-1)!i!}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, by Lemma 15, we have $A \le 2((c_0 \wedge n_n)+1)\max_{0\le i\le c_0\wedge n_n} h(i)$. Note that for $0 \le i \le c_0 \wedge n_n$,

$$\frac{h(i-1)}{h(i)} = \frac{\left(1 - \frac{1+o(1_{\delta_2,n})}{(1-\beta)n}\right)^2 i(i-1)}{\left(\frac{1+o(1_{\delta_2,n})}{(1-\beta)n}\right)^2 (n_n - i)(c_0 - i)}.$$

By taking the growth order of c_0 and n_n into account, the maximum of $h(i)$ among $0 \le i \le c_0 \wedge n_n$ is attained at

$$i_0 = \left\lceil (1+o(1_{\delta_2,n}))\frac{\sqrt{n_n c_0}}{(1-\beta)n} \right\rceil + o((\log n)^2).$$

In addition, the Stirling formula yields that picking appropriate $\delta_2 > 0$ for any $\delta > 0$, it holds that

$$h(i_0) \le C K_n^{-2\alpha F(\chi(\tilde{A}_\beta^{(j)}),\beta,\sqrt{c_0/n_{\beta n}})+\delta/2}$$

and, hence, we have

$$A \le C K_n^{-2\alpha F(\chi(\tilde{A}_\beta^{(j)}),\beta,\sqrt{c_0/n_{\beta n}})+\delta}.$$

Note that by (3.19) in [9] for any $0 < \delta_3 < 1-\alpha$ there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $n \ge n_0$ and $(z, x_1, ..., x_j) \in \mathbf{Go}^\beta$,

$$P\left(\frac{4(\alpha+\delta_3)}{\pi}(K_n \log K_n)^2 < \mathcal{R}_n^z\right) \le c^{-1}\exp(-cn^2 \log n).$$

Then, we obtain that for any $0 < \delta_3 < 1-\alpha$, all sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\gamma \le \gamma(\chi(\tilde{A}_\beta^{(j)}))$

$$\begin{aligned} & P\left(x_1, ..., x_j \in \mathcal{L}_{K_n}(\alpha+\delta_3), \frac{N_{n,\beta n}^z}{n_{\beta n}} \le \gamma^2\right) \\ \le & \sum_{c_0 \le \gamma^2 n_{\beta n}} P(T_{x_1,....,x_j} > \mathcal{R}_n^z, N_{n,\beta n}^z = c_0) + P\left(\frac{4(\alpha+\delta_3)}{\pi}(K_n \log K_n)^2 < \mathcal{R}_n^z\right) \\ \le & \sum_{c_0 \le \gamma^2 n_{\beta n}} K_n^{-2\alpha F(\chi(\tilde{A}_\beta^{(j)}),\beta,\sqrt{c_0/n_{\beta n}})+\delta} + c^{-1}\exp(-cn^2\log n) \\ \le & C K_n^{-2\alpha F(\chi(\tilde{A}_\beta^{(j)}),\beta,\gamma)+\delta} \end{aligned}$$

and for any $\gamma(\chi(\tilde{A}_\beta^{(j)})) \le \gamma$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&P\left(x_1, ..., x_j \in \mathcal{L}_{K_n}(\alpha+\delta_3), \frac{N^z_{n,\beta n}}{n_{\beta n}} \ge \gamma^2\right) \\
\le &\sum_{c_0 \le \gamma^2 n_{\beta n}} P(T_{x_1,....,x_j} > \mathcal{R}^z_n, N^z_{n,\beta n} = c_0) + P\left(\frac{4(\alpha+\delta_3)}{\pi}(K_n \log K_n)^2 < \mathcal{R}^z_n\right) \\
\le &\sum_{c_0 \le \gamma^2 n_{\beta n}} K_n^{-2\alpha F(\chi(\tilde{A}_\beta^{(j)}), \beta, \sqrt{c_0/n_{\beta n}})+\delta} + c^{-1}\exp(-cn^2\log n) \\
\le &CK_n^{-2\alpha F(\chi(\tilde{A}_\beta^{(j)}), \beta, \gamma)+\delta}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence, if we pick $\delta_1 < \delta_2 \wedge \delta_3$, the desired upper bound is completed.

Next, we will prove the desired lower bound. Let $\hat{T}_{\partial D(z,r_{\beta n-1})} := \inf\{m > T_{\partial D(z,r_{\beta n})} : S_m \in T_{\partial D(z,r_{\beta n-1})}\}$. Note that by (i) and (ii) in Lemma 15, the strong Markov property yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
&P(T_{\partial D(z,r_{n-1})} < T_{x_1,...,x_j} \wedge \hat{T}_{\partial D(z,r_{\beta n-1})}) \\
\ge &P(T_{\partial D(z,r_{\beta n})} < T_{x_1,...,x_j})\tilde{q}_{1,2} \ge cK_n^{-\delta/4}.
\end{aligned}
$$

In addition, for $z \in D(0, r_{\beta n-1})$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&P(T_{x_1,....,x_j} > \mathcal{R}_n, N^z_{n,\beta n} = c_0+1) \\
\ge &P(T_{\partial D(z,r_{n-1})} < T_{x_1,...,x_j} \wedge \hat{T}_{\partial D(z,r_{\beta n-1})}) \\
&\times \min_{y' \in \partial D(z,r_{n-1})} P^{y'}(T_{x_1,....,x_j} > \mathcal{R}_n, N^z_{n,\beta n} = c_0),
\end{aligned}
$$

for $z \in D(0, r_{\beta n-1})^c \cap D(0, r_{\beta n})$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&P(T_{x_1,....,x_j} > \mathcal{R}_n, N^z_{n,\beta n} \in \{c_0, c_0+1\}) \\
\ge &P(T_{\partial D(z,r_{n-1})} < T_{x_1,...,x_j} \wedge \hat{T}_{\partial D(z,r_{\beta n-1})}) \\
\times &\min_{y' \in \partial D(z,r_{n-1})} P^{y'}(T_{x_1,....,x_j} > \mathcal{R}_n, N^z_{n,\beta n} = c_0),
\end{aligned}
$$

and otherwise

$$
\begin{aligned}
&P(T_{x_1,....,x_j} > \mathcal{R}_n, N^z_{n,\beta n} = c_0) \\
\ge &P(T_{\partial D(z,r_{n-1})} < T_{x_1,...,x_j} \wedge \hat{T}_{\partial D(z,r_{\beta n-1})}) \\
\times &\min_{y' \in \partial D(z,r_{n-1})} P^{y'}(T_{x_1,....,x_j} > \mathcal{R}_n, N^z_{n,\beta n} = c_0).
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, by (3.14),

$$
\begin{aligned}
&P(T_{x_1,....,x_j} > \mathcal{R}_n, N^z_{n,\beta n} \in \{c_0, c_0+1\}) \\
\ge &P(T_{\partial D(z,r_{n-1})} < T_{x_1,...,x_j} \wedge \hat{T}_{\partial D(z,r_{\beta n-1})}) \\
&\times \sum_{0 \le i \le (c_0-1)\wedge(n_n-1)} \tilde{q}_{1,1}^{c_0-1-i}\tilde{q}_{1,2}^{i+1}\frac{(c_0-1)!}{(c_0-1-i)!i!}\tilde{q}_{2,1}^{i}\tilde{q}_{2,2}^{n_n-i-1}\frac{(n_n-1)!}{(n_n-i-1)!i!} \\
\ge &cK_n^{-\delta/4}\tilde{q}_{1,1}^{c_0-1-i_0}\tilde{q}_{1,2}^{i_0+1}\frac{(c_0-1)!}{(c_0-1-i_0)!i_0!}\tilde{q}_{2,1}^{i_0}\tilde{q}_{2,2}^{n_n-i_0-1}\frac{(n_n-1)!}{(n_n-i_0-1)!i!} \\
\ge &cK_n^{-2\alpha F(\chi(\tilde{A}_\beta^{(j)}), \beta, \sqrt{c_0/n_{\beta n}})-\delta/2},
\end{aligned}
$$

picking appropriate $\delta_2 > 0$ in (ii) of Lemma 15. Note that by Lemma 4.1 in [9] for any $0 < \delta_3 < \alpha$ there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $n \geq n_0$ and $(z, x_1, ..., x_j) \in \mathbf{Go}^\beta$,

$$P\left(\frac{4(\alpha-\delta_3)}{\pi}(K_n \log K_n)^2 > \mathcal{R}_n^z\right) \leq c^{-1}\exp(-cn^2 \log n).$$

Thus, we obtain that for all sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $(z, x_1, ..., x_j) \in \mathbf{Go}^\beta$ and $\gamma \leq \gamma(\chi(\tilde{A}_\beta^{(j)}))$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&P\left(x_1, ..., x_j \in \mathcal{L}_{K_n}(\alpha-\delta_3), \frac{N_{n,\beta n}^z}{n_{\beta n}} \leq \gamma^2\right)\\
\geq& P(T_{x_1,....,x_j} > \mathcal{R}_n^z, N_{n,\beta n}^z \in \{\lceil \gamma^2 n_{\beta n}\rceil, \lceil \gamma^2 n_{\beta n}\rceil - 1\})\\
-&P\left(\frac{4(\alpha-\delta_3)}{\pi}(K_n \log K_n)^2 > \mathcal{R}_n^z\right)\\
\geq& cK_n^{-2\alpha F(\chi(\tilde{A}_\beta^{(j)}),\beta,\gamma)-\delta/2} - c^{-1}\exp(-cn^2\log n)\\
\geq& cK_n^{-2\alpha F(\chi(\tilde{A}_\beta^{(j)}),\beta,\gamma)-\delta},
\end{aligned}$$

and for $\gamma \geq \gamma(\chi(\tilde{A}_\beta^{(j)}))$

$$\begin{aligned}
&P\left(x_1, ..., x_j \in \mathcal{L}_{K_n}(\alpha-\delta_3), \frac{N_{n,\beta n}^z}{n_{\beta n}} \geq \gamma^2\right)\\
\geq& P(T_{x_1,....,x_j} > \mathcal{R}_n^z, N_{n,\beta n}^z \in \{\lceil \gamma^2 n_{\beta n}\rceil, \lceil \gamma^2 n_{\beta n}\rceil + 1\})\\
-&P\left(\frac{4(\alpha-\delta_3)}{\pi}(K_n \log K_n)^2 > \mathcal{R}_n^z\right)\\
\geq& cK_n^{-2\alpha F(\chi(\tilde{A}_\beta^{(j)}),\beta,\gamma)-\delta/2} - c^{-1}\exp(-cn^2\log n)\\
\geq& cK_n^{-2\alpha F(\chi(\tilde{A}_\beta^{(j)}),\beta,\gamma)-\delta}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if we pick $\delta_1 < \delta_2 \wedge \delta_3$, the desired result is completed. □

4.2 Proof of the upper bound in Theorem 2

We will prove in this subsection that for any $0 < \alpha, \beta, \delta < 1$, there exist $C > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$P(|\tilde{\Theta}_{\alpha,0,\beta,n}| \geq K_n^{\rho_j(\alpha,\beta)+(4+j)\delta}) \leq CK_n^{-\epsilon}, \tag{4.51}$$

where

$$\tilde{\Theta}_{\alpha,\beta_2,\beta_1,n} = \tilde{\Theta}_{\alpha,\beta_2,\beta_1,n}(j) := \{(x_1, ..., x_j) \in \mathcal{L}_{K_n}(\alpha)^j : K_n^{\beta_2} \leq d(x_i, x_l) \leq K_n^{\beta_1}\}.$$

Indeed, (4.51) implies the upper bound in Theorem 2 since $\log K_n^\beta / \log K_{n+1} \to \beta$ and $\beta \mapsto \rho_j(\alpha, \beta)$ is continuous.

Now we show (4.51) by induction on $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that [9] showed (4.51) for $j = 1, 2$. We assume that (4.51) holds for $j-1$. We divide the assertion into two corresponding estimate for $\tilde{\Theta}_{\alpha,\eta,\beta,n}$ and $\tilde{\Theta}_{\alpha,0,\beta,n} \cap \tilde{\Theta}^c_{\alpha,\eta,\beta,n}$ for $0 < \eta < \beta$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{E}[(0), ({K_n}^\beta)](j) \cap \mathcal{E}[({K_n}^\eta), ({K_n}^\beta)](j)^c\\
\subset& \cup_{i=1}^j \{(x_1, ..., x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, ..., x_j) \in \mathcal{E}[(0), ({K_n}^\beta)](j-1) :\\
&\exists l \in \{1, ..., i-1, i+1, ..., j\} \text{ such that } d(x_i, x_l) \leq n^\eta\},
\end{aligned}$$

and, hence, there exists $C>0$ such that for any $n\in\mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned}&|\mathcal{E}[(0),({K_n}^{\beta})](j)\cap\mathcal{E}[({K_n}^{\eta}),({K_n}^{\beta})](j)^c|\\ \le&|\mathcal{E}[(0),({K_n}^{\beta})](j-1)|\times j(j-1)Cn^{2\eta}.\end{aligned}\tag{4.52}$$

Hence, for the former one, note

$$|\tilde{\Theta}_{\alpha,0,\beta,n}(j)\cap\tilde{\Theta}^c_{\alpha,\eta,\beta,n}(j)|\le CK_n^{\delta}|\tilde{\Theta}_{\alpha,0,\beta,n}(j-1)|,$$

for $2\eta<\delta$ and all sufficiently large $n\in\mathbb{N}$. Therefore, (B) in Lemma 27 yields

$$\begin{aligned}&P(|\tilde{\Theta}_{\alpha,0,\beta,n}(j)\cap\tilde{\Theta}^c_{\alpha,\eta,\beta,n}(j)|\ge K_n^{\rho_j(\alpha,\beta)+(4+j)\delta})\\ \le&P(|\tilde{\Theta}_{\alpha,0,\beta,n}(j-1)|\ge K_n^{\rho_{j-1}(\alpha,\beta)+(3+j)\delta})\le CK_n^{-\epsilon}.\end{aligned}\tag{4.53}$$

For the latter one, we use the following lemma.

Lemma 16. *There exist $h<2$, $C>0$ and $\epsilon>0$ such that for any $\beta'\in[\eta,\beta]$*

$$q_{n,\beta'}:=P(|\tilde{\Theta}_{\alpha,\beta' h/2,\beta',n}|\ge K_n^{\rho_j(\alpha,\beta')+3\delta})\le CK_n^{-\epsilon}.$$

We observe that the assertion for $\tilde{\Theta}_{\alpha,\eta,\beta,n}$ indeed follows from this lemma. Set $\beta_j=\beta(h/2)^j$ and $l=\min\{j:\beta_j\le\eta\}$. By Lemma 16 we have $q_{n,\beta_j}\to 0$ as $n\to\infty$ for $j=0,...,l-1$. Combining this with the monotonicity of $\beta\mapsto\rho_j(\alpha,\beta)$, we obtain the desired assertion. By virtue of this and (4.53), we establish (4.51). Thus, the proof of the upper bound is now reduced to show Lemma 16.

Proof of Lemma 16. Let $\hat{Z}_{n,\beta'}:=(4r_{\beta' n-4}\mathbb{Z}_n^2)\cap\mathbb{Z}_n^2$ and $z_{\beta'}(x)$ the point closest to x in $\hat{Z}_{n,\beta'}$. Pick δ_1 which is satisfied with the result of Corollary 14. In addition, we change β in the definition of γ_0 into β'. By the simple argument, we have

$$q_{n,\beta'}\le I_1+I_2,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}I_1&:=P\bigg(\min_{z\in\hat{Z}_{n,\beta'}}\frac{N^z_{n,\beta' n}}{n_{\beta' n}}\le\gamma_0^2\bigg),\\ I_2&:=P\bigg(|\tilde{\Theta}_{\alpha,\beta' h/2,\beta',n}|\ge K_n^{\rho_j(\alpha,\beta')+3\delta};\min_{z\in\hat{Z}_{n,\beta'}}\frac{N^z_{n,\beta' n}}{n_{\beta' n}}>\gamma_0^2\bigg).\end{aligned}$$

Set $\epsilon:=(\alpha F_{0,\beta'}(\gamma_0^2-\delta_0)-(1-\beta'))\wedge\delta$. Note that $\epsilon>0$. Then, if we consider $\delta'<\delta_0\wedge\delta_1$ for any $\delta>0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}I_2\le&P\bigg(\bigg|\bigg\{(x_1,...,x_j)\in\mathcal{L}_{K_n}(\alpha)^j\cap\mathcal{E}[(K_n^{\eta}),(K_n^{\beta'})]:\\ &\frac{N^{z_{\beta'}(x_1)}_{n,\beta' n}}{n_{\beta' n}}>\gamma_0^2\bigg\}\bigg|\ge K_n^{\rho_j(\alpha,\beta')+3\delta}\bigg)\\ \le&K_n^{-\rho_j(\alpha,\beta')-3\delta}\\ &\times E\bigg[\bigg|\{(x_1,...,x_j)\in\mathcal{L}_{K_n}(\alpha)^j\cap\mathcal{E}[(K_n^{\eta}),(K_n^{\beta'})]:\frac{N^{z_{\beta'}(x_1)}_{n,\beta' n}}{n_{\beta' n}}>\gamma_0^2\bigg\}\bigg|\bigg]\\ =&K_n^{-\rho_j(\alpha,\beta')-3\delta}\sum_{(x_1,...x_j)\in\mathcal{E}[(K_n^{\eta}),(K_n^{\beta'})]}P\bigg(x_1,...,x_j\in\mathcal{L}_{K_n}(\alpha);\frac{N^{z_{\beta'}(x_1)}_{n,\beta' n}}{n_{\beta' n}}>\gamma_0^2\bigg)\\ \le&CK_n^{-\rho_j(\alpha,\beta')-3\delta}\sum_{(x_1,...x_j)\in\mathcal{E}[(K_n^{\eta}),(K_n^{\beta'})]}K_n^{-2\alpha B_{1,\delta'}+\delta}\\ \le&CK_n^{-\delta}.\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality comes from (A) in Proposition 12. Then, by (i) in Lemma 13, there exists $C > 0$ such that for all sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$I_1 \le |\hat{Z}_{n,\beta'}| C K_n^{-2\alpha F_{0,\beta'}(\gamma_0^2-\delta_0)+\epsilon/2} \le C K_n^{2-2\beta'-2\alpha F_{0,\beta'}(\gamma_0^2-\delta_0)+\epsilon} \le C K_n^{-\epsilon}.$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 16. □

4.3 Proof of the lower bound in Theorem 2

Proof of the lower bound in Theorem 2. In this subsection, we will prove for $2 - 2\beta - 2\alpha F_{0,\beta}(\gamma) \ge 0$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} P(|\tilde{\Theta}_{\alpha,0,\beta,n}| \ge K_n^{2+2\beta-\alpha j F_{2,\beta}(\gamma)-(2j+1)\delta}) = 1. \tag{4.54}$$

Since $r_{\beta n-3} \le K_n^{\beta}$ and $\beta \mapsto \rho_j(\alpha,\beta)$ is continuous, it suffices to show this to obtain the desired lower bound. Let $\mathcal{Z}_n \subset \mathbb{Z}_n^2$ be a maximal set which are $4r_{\beta n+4}$ separated. We will say that a point $z \in \mathcal{Z}_n$ is (n,β)-qualified if $|N_{n,k}^z - n_k\gamma^2| \le k$ for $\beta n \le k \le n-1$ and in addition

$$\tilde{W}^z := |\{y \in D(z, r_{\beta n-4}), y \in \mathcal{L}_{K_n}(\alpha)\}| \ge K_n^{2\beta(1-\alpha\gamma^2)-2\delta}.$$

So it holds that

$$|\tilde{\Theta}_{\alpha,0,\beta,n}| \ge \sum_{z\in\mathcal{Z}_n} (\tilde{W}^z)^j \ge |\{z \in \mathcal{Z}_n, z \text{ is } (n,\beta)\text{-qualified}\}| K_n^{2j\beta(1-\alpha\gamma^2)-2j\delta}.$$

Therefore, we obtain (4.54) as soon as we show that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} P(|\{z \in \mathcal{Z}_n, z \text{ is } (n,\beta)\text{-qualified}\}| \ge K_n^{(2-2\beta)(1-\alpha(1-\gamma\beta)^2/(1-\beta)^2)-\delta}) = 1. \tag{4.55}$$

(4.55) has already been shown by (10.3) in [9]. Indeed, while the definition of K_n is slightly different from that of [9], (4.55) comes from the fact that $\delta > 0$ is arbitrary. Therefore, we obtain the desired result. □

5 Proof of Theorem 1

5.1 Proof of the upper bound in Theorem 1

Proposition 17. *For any $\delta > 0$ there exist $C > 0$ and $\delta' > 0$ such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and uniformly in $x_1, ..., x_j \in \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\delta'}[(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}]$*

$$C^{-1} n^{-2\alpha B_{2,\delta'}-\delta} \le P(x_1, ..., x_j \in \mathcal{L}_n(\alpha)) \le C n^{-2\alpha B_{2,\delta'}+\delta}.$$

Proof. Then, if we substitute γ in (ii) of Lemma 13 into $\gamma(\chi(\tilde{A}_{\beta}^{(j)}))$, (3.40) completes the desired result. □

Proof of the upper bound in Theorem 1. (B) in Proposition 12 and Proposition 17 yield that for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $C > 0$ such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\sum_{(x_1,...,x_j)\in\mathcal{E}[(n^\eta),(n^\beta)]} P(x_1, ..., x_j \in \mathcal{L}_n(\alpha)) \le C n^{\hat{\rho}_j(\alpha,\beta)+\epsilon}.$$

Now we will extend the condition of "$\mathcal{E}[(n^\eta),(n^\beta)]$" to "$\mathcal{E}[(0),(n^\beta)]$" by induction on $j \in \mathbb{N}$. It suffices to show for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $C > 0$ such that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\sum_{(x_1,...,x_{j-1})\in\mathcal{E}[(0),(n^\beta)]} P(x_1, ..., x_{j-1} \in \mathcal{L}_n(\alpha)) \le C n^{\hat{\rho}_j(\alpha,\beta)+j\epsilon}.$$

For $j=1$, by (B) in Proposition 12 and Proposition 17 it is trivial that

$$\sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}_n^2} P(x\in\mathcal{L}_n(\alpha)) \le Cn^{\hat{\rho}_1(\alpha,\beta)+\epsilon}.$$

Assume the claim holds for $j-1$ with $j\ge 2$. We will show that the claim holds for j. Pick $\eta>0$ with $2\eta<\epsilon$. Therefore, by (B) in Proposition 12, Lemma 27 and Proposition 17, the same argument as (4.52) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&E[|\{(x_1,...,x_j)\in\mathcal{L}_n(\alpha)^j : d(x_i,x_l)\le n^\beta \text{ for any } 1\le i,l\le j\}|]\\
=&\sum_{(x_1,...,x_j)\in\mathcal{E}[(0),(n^\beta)](j)} P(x_1,...,x_j\in\mathcal{L}_n(\alpha))\\
\le&\sum_{(x_1,...x_j)\in\mathcal{E}[(n^\eta),(n^\beta)](j)} P(x_1,...,x_j\in\mathcal{L}_n(\alpha))\\
&+\sum_{(x_1,...x_{j-1})\in\mathcal{E}[(0),(n^\beta)](j-1)} P(x_1,...,x_{j-i+1}\in\mathcal{L}_n(\alpha))Cn^{2\eta}\\
\le&Cn^{\hat{\rho}_j(\alpha,\beta)+\epsilon}+Cn^{\hat{\rho}_{j-1}(\alpha,\beta)+(j-1)\epsilon+2\eta}\le Cn^{\hat{\rho}_j(\alpha,\beta)+j\epsilon},
\end{aligned}$$

and, hence, the desired result is completed. □

5.2 Proof of the lower bound in Theorem 1

Proof of the lower bound in Theorem 1. It is trivial that $\chi(A^{(j)}_{1-s})=j/(1+(j-1)(1-s))$. Hence, if we consider $(x_1,...,x_j)\in\mathcal{E}[(2^{-j}n^s),(2^jn^s)]$ for $\eta<s<1$, then Proposition 17 yields

$$P(x_1,...,x_j\in\mathcal{L}_n(\alpha))\ge\exp\bigg(-\frac{2j\alpha\log n}{1+(j-1)(1-s)}+o(\log n)\bigg).$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned}
R_s:=\Big\{&(x_1,...,x_j): x_1\in\mathbb{Z}_n^2,\\
&x_i\in(0,4^{-j}n^s)+D(x_{i-1},(2^{-j}+2^{-2j+1})n^s) \text{ for any } 2\le i\le j\Big\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that there exists $c>0$ such that for any $n\in\mathbb{N}$,

$$|R_s|\ge cn^{2+2(j-1)s}.$$

In addition,

$$\mathcal{E}[(2^{-j}n^s),(2^jn^s)]\supset R_s.$$

Therefore, (B) in Proposition 12 and the simple computation yield for $\eta<s<1$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{(x_1,...,x_j)\in\mathcal{E}[(2^{-j}n^s),(2^jn^s)]} P(x_1,...,x_j\in\mathcal{L}_n(\alpha))\\
\ge&\sum_{(x_1,...,x_j)\in R_s}\exp\bigg(-\frac{2j\alpha\log n}{1+(j-1)(1-s)}+o(\log n)\bigg)\\
\ge&cn^{2+2(j-1)s}\times\exp\bigg(-\frac{2j\alpha\log n}{1+(j-1)(1-s)}+o(\log n)\bigg).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $2+2(j-1)s-2\alpha j/(1+(j-1)(1-s))|_{s=(1+(1-\sqrt{j\alpha})/(j-1))\wedge\beta}=\hat{\rho}_j(\alpha,\beta)$ and η is arbitrary, we obtain the result. □

6 Corollaries

In this subsection, we will argue variety results which correspond to the extension of main results. By the arrange of the proof of Theorem 1 we obtain the following corollaries. The first result implies that the property "the probability that multipoint are late points is high" is preserved when other points are added.

Corollary 18. *(additivity for the probability as the geometric structures of late points) Fix* $0 < \alpha, \eta < 1$, $\epsilon > 0$, h, $g \in \mathbb{N}$. *There exists* $c > 0$ *such that for any* $n \in \mathbb{N}$ *and* $x_1(n), ..., x_h(n)$, $w_1(n), ..., w_g(n)$, $z_1(n), ..., z_g(n) \in \mathcal{E}[(n^\eta), (n^{1-\eta})]$ *with*

$$P(w_1, ..., w_g \in \mathcal{L}_n(\alpha)) \geq P(z_1, ..., z_g \in \mathcal{L}_n(\alpha)),$$
$$d(x_1, w_1) = d(x_1, z_1) \geq 4 \max_{2 \leq i \leq g} d(w_1, w_i) \vee d(z_1, z_i),$$

it holds that

$$P(x_1, ..., x_h, w_1, ..., w_g \in \mathcal{L}_n(\alpha)) \geq cn^{-\epsilon} P(x_1, ..., x_h, z_1, ..., z_g \in \mathcal{L}_n(\alpha)).$$

The second result implies that the property "the probability that multipoint are late points is high" is preserved when the space state is changed.

Corollary 19. *Fix* $0 < \alpha, \eta < 1$, $\xi > 1$, $\epsilon > 0$ *and* $j \in \mathbb{N}$. *There exists* $c > 0$ *such that for any* $n \in \mathbb{N}$ *and* $w_1(n), ..., w_g(n)$, $z_1(n), ..., z_g(n) \in \mathcal{E}[(n^\eta), (n^{1-\eta})]$ *and*

$$P(w_1, ..., w_j \in \mathcal{L}_n(\alpha)) \geq P(z_1, ..., z_j \in \mathcal{L}_n(\alpha)),$$

it holds that

$$P(w_1, ..., w_j \in \mathcal{L}_{n^\xi}(\alpha)) \geq cn^{-\epsilon} P(z_1, ..., z_j \in \mathcal{L}_{n^\xi}(\alpha)).$$

Proof of Corollary 18. By Lemma 10, for any $\delta' > 0$ there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ for any $n \geq n_0$ and $w_1, ..., w_j$, $z_1, ..., z_g \in D(0, n/3)$ the following holds: there exist $(a^1_{i,l})_{1 \leq i,l \leq g}$, $(a^2_{i,l})_{1 \leq i,l \leq g}$ and $(a^3_{i,l})_{1 \leq i,l \leq h}$ such that $(w_1, ..., w_g) \in \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\delta'}[(a^1_{i,l})_{1 \leq i,l \leq g}](g, n)$, $(z_1, ..., z_g) \in \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\delta'}[(a^2_{i,l})_{1 \leq i,l \leq g}](g, n)$ and $(x_1, ..., x_h) \in \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\delta'}[(a^3_{i,l})_{1 \leq i,l \leq h}](h, n)$. Proposition 17 yields that for any $\delta > 0$ there exists $\delta' > 0$ such that, uniformly in $(x_1, ..., x_j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2_n$ and for all sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$P(w_1, ..., w_g \in \mathcal{L}_n(\alpha)) \leq n^{-2\alpha\chi((a^1_{i,l})_{1 \leq i,l \leq g}) + \delta},$$
$$P(z_1, ..., z_g \in \mathcal{L}_n(\alpha)) \geq n^{-2\alpha\chi((a^2_{i,l})_{1 \leq i,l \leq g}) - \delta}. \tag{6.56}$$

Hence, if we assume

$$P(w_1, ..., w_g \in \mathcal{L}_n(\alpha)) \geq P(z_1, ..., z_g \in \mathcal{L}_n(\alpha)),$$

for any $\epsilon' > 0$, there exists $\delta' > 0$ and $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $n \geq n_0$

$$\chi((a^1_{i,l})_{1 \leq i,l \leq g}) \leq \chi((a^2_{i,l})_{1 \leq i,l \leq g}) + \epsilon'. \tag{6.57}$$

In addition, let $s = s(n) := 1 - \log d(x_1, w_1)/\log n = 1 - \log d(x_1, z_1)/\log n$. Let $(\hat{a}^v_{i,l})_{1 \leq i,l \leq j} := M\{(a^3_{i,l})_{1 \leq i,l \leq h}, (a^v_{i,l})_{1 \leq i,l \leq g}, s\}$ for $v = 1, 2$. Note that $d(x_i, w_l) \leq d(x_1, w_1)/4$ and, hence, simple triangle inequality yields that for any $1 \leq i \leq h$ and $1 \leq l \leq g$,

$$\begin{aligned} d(x_i, w_l) \geq & - d(x_i, x_1) + d(x_1, w_1) - d(w_1, w_l) \\ & \geq - \frac{n^{1-s}}{4} + n^{1-s} - \frac{n^{1-s}}{4} \geq \frac{1}{2} n^{1-s}, \\ d(x_i, w_l) \leq & d(x_i, x_1) + d(x_1, w_1) + d(w_1, w_l) \\ & \leq \frac{n^{1-s}}{4} + n^{1-s} + \frac{n^{1-s}}{4} \leq 2n^{1-s+\delta'}. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, the same argument yields that $n^{1-s}/2 \le d(x_i, z_l) \le 2n^{1-s+\delta'}$. Then,

$$(x_1, ..., x_h, w_1, ..., w_g) \in \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\delta'}[(\hat{a}^1_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le g+h}](g+h, n),$$
$$(x_1, ..., x_h, z_1, ..., z_g) \in \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\delta'}[(\hat{a}^2_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le g+h}](g+h, n).$$

Again, by the same argument as (6.56), we obtain that for any $\delta > 0$ there exists $\delta' > 0$ such that, uniformly in $(x_1, ..., x_j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2_n$ and for all sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} P(x_1, ..., x_h, w_1, ..., w_g \in \mathcal{L}_n(\alpha)) &\ge n^{-2\alpha\chi((\hat{a}^1_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j})-\delta} \\ &\ge n^{-2\alpha g(s,\chi(a^3_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}),\chi((a^1_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}))-\delta}, \\ P(x_1, ..., x_h, z_1, ..., z_g \in \mathcal{L}_n(\alpha)) &\le n^{-2\alpha\chi((\hat{a}^2_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j})+\delta} \\ &\le n^{-2\alpha g(s,\chi(a^3_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}),\chi((a^2_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}))+\delta}, \end{aligned}$$

where $g(t, b, c)$ is the same function as Lemma 9. Since $g(t, b, c)$ is continuous and monotonically increasing in c, we obtain the desired result. □

Proof of Corollary 19. We consider $(a^1_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}$, $(a^2_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}$ for $w_1, ..., w_j$, $z_1, ..., z_j \in \mathcal{E}[(n^\eta), (n^{1-\eta})]$ as well as Corollary 18. Then, we also obtain the result which corresponds to (6.57). Note that for $v = 1, 2$

$$\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\delta'}[(a^v_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}](j, n) = \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\delta'/\xi}\left[\left(\frac{\xi - 1 + a^v_{i,l}}{\xi}\right)_{1\le i,l\le j}\right](j, n^\xi).$$

Hence, we obtain that for any $\delta > 0$ there exists $\delta' > 0$ such that, uniformly in $(x_1, ..., x_j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2_n$ and for all sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} P(w_1, ..., w_j \in \mathcal{L}_{n^\xi}(\alpha)) &\ge n^{-2\alpha\chi(((\xi-1+a^1_{i,l})/\xi)_{1\le i,l\le j})-\delta}, \\ P(z_1, ..., z_j \in \mathcal{L}_{n^\xi}(\alpha)) &\le n^{-2\alpha\chi(((\xi-1+a^2_{i,l})/\xi)_{1\le i,l\le j})+\delta}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.58}$$

Note that (3.39) and (6.57) yield that for any $\epsilon' > 0$ there exists $\delta' > 0$ such that for all sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\chi\left(\left(\frac{\xi - 1 + a^1_{i,l}}{\xi}\right)_{1\le i,l\le j}\right) \le \chi\left(\left(\frac{\xi - 1 + a^2_{i,l}}{\xi}\right)_{1\le i,l\le j}\right) + \epsilon'. \tag{6.59}$$

Therefore, (6.58) and (6.59) complete the desired result. □

Next, we verify general results as Theorem 1. By Lemma 10, we have that any $(x_1, ..., x_j)$ included in some $V \in \hat{\mathcal{E}}_{\delta'}[(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}](j, n)$ for some $(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j} \in \mathcal{M}^{\beta,0}_j$ and $0 < \beta < 1$. Then we extend the condition "$d(x_i, x_l) \le n^\beta$" to $d(x_i, x_l) \le n^{1-a_{i,l}}$ for some $(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j} \in \mathcal{M}^{\beta,0}_j$ as follows.

Corollary 20. *For any $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $(a_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j} \in \mathcal{M}^{\beta,0}_j$ and $0 < \beta < 1$,*

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log E[|\{(x_1, ..., x_j) \in \mathcal{L}_n(\alpha)^j : (x_1, ..., x_j) \le \mathcal{E}[(0), (n^{1-a_{i,l}})_{1\le i,l\le j}]\}|]}{\log n} \\ &= \max_{\substack{(a'_{i,l})\in\mathcal{M}^{\beta,0}_j, \\ a'_{i,l}\ge a_{i,l}}} 2 + 2\Xi((a'_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}) - 2\alpha\chi((a'_{i,l})_{1\le i,l\le j}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Therefore, if we again use the same method as that of Theorem 1 by using Proposition 17, the desired result is completed with the minor modification. □

7 Difference from favorite points and high points of a Gaussian free field

7.1 Arguments

In this section, we discuss the difference between late points and favorite points or high points of a GFF in two dimensions. As mentioned in Section 1, we have obtained correspondence of $\mathcal{L}_n(\alpha)$, $\Psi_n(\alpha)$ and $\mathcal{V}_n(\alpha)$. Then, we have the question: do late points and favorite points or high points of a GFF have the difference? The answer is yes and in this section, we will discuss it. We clear up the geometric structure of $\mathcal{L}_n(\alpha)$ and attend some problem as follows.

Theorem 21. *For any $0 < \alpha_1 \le \alpha_2 < 1$, $0 < \beta < 1$*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log E[|\{(x_1,x_2) \in \mathcal{L}_n(\alpha_1) \times \mathcal{L}_n(\alpha_2) : d(x_1,x_2) \le n^\beta\}|]}{\log n} = \hat{\nu}_2(\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\beta),$$

where

$$\hat{\nu}_2(\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\beta) := \max_{\beta' \le \beta} 2 + 2\beta' - \frac{4\alpha_1}{2-\beta'} - 2(1-\alpha_2+\alpha_1)$$
$$\begin{cases} 2 + 2\beta - \frac{4\alpha_1}{2-\beta} - 2(1-\alpha_2+\alpha_1) & (\beta \le 2-\sqrt{2\alpha_1}), \\ 6 - 4\sqrt{2\alpha_1} - 2(1-\alpha_2+\alpha_1) & (\beta \ge 2-\sqrt{2\alpha_1}). \end{cases}$$

Next, we study the geometric structure of $\Psi_n(\alpha)$ and solve the problem as follows.

Theorem 22. *For any $0 < \alpha_1 \le \alpha_2 < 1$, $0 < \beta < 1$*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log E[|\{(x_1,x_2) \in \Psi_n(\alpha_1) \times \Psi_n(\alpha_2) : d(x_1,x_2) \le n^\beta\}|]}{\log n} = \hat{\mu}_2(\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\beta),$$

where

$$\hat{\mu}_2(\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\beta) := \max_{\substack{\beta' \le \beta, \\ \alpha_1 \le \alpha_1'}} 2 + 2\beta' - \frac{2(\sqrt{\alpha_2} - \sqrt{\alpha_1'})^2}{\beta'(2-\beta')} - \frac{4\sqrt{\alpha_1'\alpha_2}}{2-\beta'}.$$

Theorem 23. *For any $0 < \alpha_1 \le \alpha_2 < 1$, $0 < \beta < 1$*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log E[|\{(x_1,x_2) \in \mathcal{V}_n(\alpha_1) \times \mathcal{V}_n(\alpha_2) : d(x_1,x_2) \le n^\beta\}|]}{\log n} = \hat{\mu}_2(\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\beta).$$

Note that it is easy to compute that

$$\hat{\nu}_2(\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\beta) < \hat{\mu}_2(\alpha_1,\alpha_2,\beta).$$

The essential reason of the difference is that $\mathcal{L}_n(\alpha)$ is satisfied with the following: for $0 < \alpha_1 \le \alpha_2 < 1$, $0 < \beta < 1$ and $\{x_1^{(n)}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, $\{x_2^{(n)}\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ with $d(x_1^{(n)}, x_2^{(n)}) \approx n^\beta$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log P\left(x_1^{(n)} \in \mathcal{L}_n(\alpha_1) \middle| x_2^{(n)} \in \mathcal{L}_n(\alpha_2)\right)}{\log n}$$

is independent of the value of α_2. This property doesn't hold for $\Psi_n(\alpha_1) \times \Psi_n(\alpha_2)$ or $\mathcal{V}_n(\alpha_1) \times \mathcal{V}_n(\alpha_2)$.

Remark 7. *We conjecture these points also have the difference in probability sense. That is, we expect that in probability the value of*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log |\{(x_1,x_2) \in \mathcal{L}_n(\alpha_1) \times \mathcal{L}_n(\alpha_2) : d(x_1,x_2) \le n^\beta\}|}{\log n}$$

is different from that of $\Psi_n(\alpha_1) \times \Psi_n(\alpha_2)$ or $\mathcal{V}_n(\alpha_1) \times \mathcal{V}_n(\alpha_2)$. However, we omit these results since it is expected that the proofs are long and almost the same as that of [3, 9].

7.2 Proof of Theorems 21, 22 and 23

To show Theorem 21, we introduce the following proposition, which corresponds to (B) in Proposition 17.

Proposition 24. *Fix $0 < \beta < 1$. Then, for any $\delta > 0$ there exist $0 < \delta' < 1 - \beta$ and $C > 0$ such that for any x_1, $x_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_n^2$ with $n^\beta/4 \le d(x_1, x_2) \le 4n^{\beta+\delta'}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\begin{aligned}
&C^{-1} \exp\left\{ -\left(\frac{4\alpha_1}{2-\beta} - 2(1-\alpha_2+\alpha_1)\right)\log n - \delta \log n \right\} \\
\le& P(x_1 \in \mathcal{L}_n(\alpha_1), x_2 \in \mathcal{L}_n(\alpha_2)) \\
\le& C \exp\left\{ -\left(\frac{4\alpha_1}{2-\beta} - 2(1-\alpha_2+\alpha_1)\right)\log n + \delta \log n \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. The Markov property yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&P(x_1 \in \mathcal{L}_n(\alpha_1), x_2 \in \mathcal{L}_n(\alpha_2)) \\
=&E\left[P^y\left(x_2 \in \mathcal{L}_n(\alpha_2 - \alpha_1 + o(1)) \middle| \mathcal{F}\left(\frac{4\alpha_1}{\pi}(n\log n)^2 \right) \right) 1_{\{x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{L}_n(\alpha_1)\}} \right] \\
=&E\left[P^y\left(x_2 \in \mathcal{L}_n(\alpha_2 - \alpha_1 + o(1)) \middle| \mathcal{F}\left(\frac{4\alpha_1}{\pi}(n\log n)^2 \right) \right) \right] \times P(x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{L}_n(\alpha_1)).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, since Proposition 17 holds uniformly in x_1, $x_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_n^2$ with $n^\beta/4 \le d(x_1, x_2) \le 4n^{\beta+\delta'}$, we obtain the desired results. □

Proof of Theorem 21. If we again use the same method as that that used in the Theorem 1, by using Proposition 24 instead of Proposition 17, with a minor modification, the desired result is completed. □

To show Theorems 22 and 23, we introduce the following propositions.

Proposition 25. *Fix $0 < \beta < 1$. Then, for any $\delta > 0$ there exist $0 < \delta' < 1 - \beta$ and $C > 0$ such that for any x_1, $x_2 \in D(0, n)$ with $n^\beta/4 \le d(x_1, x_2) \le 4n^{\beta+\delta'}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\exp\left\{ -\min_{\alpha_1 \le \alpha_1'} \left(\frac{2(\sqrt{\alpha_2} - \sqrt{\alpha_1'})^2}{\beta(2-\beta)} + \frac{4\sqrt{\alpha_1'\alpha_2}}{2-\beta} \right) \log n - \delta \log n \right\} \\
\le& P(x_1 \in \Psi_n(\alpha_1), x_2 \in \Psi_n(\alpha_2)) \\
\le& \exp\left\{ -\min_{\alpha_1 \le \alpha_1'} \left(\frac{2(\sqrt{\alpha_2} - \sqrt{\alpha_1'})^2}{\beta(2-\beta)} + \frac{4\sqrt{\alpha_1'\alpha_2}}{2-\beta} \right) \log n + \delta \log n \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let $\tilde{\alpha} := \lceil 4\alpha(\log n)^2/\pi \rceil$ and x_1, x_2 be two distinct points included in $D(0, n)$, and set

$$(U_1, U_2, U_3) := (x_1, x_2, \partial D(0, n))$$

and

$$b_{i,l} := P^{U_i}(\min_{s \in \{1,2,3\}} T_{U_s} = T_{U_l}),$$

for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ and $l \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. First, we will show the lower bound. Then, (3.15) yields that for

$\alpha_1 \le \alpha_2$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&P(x_1 \in \Psi_n(\alpha_1), x_2 \in \Psi_n(\alpha_2), T_{x_1} < T_{x_2} \wedge \tau_n) \\
\ge& P(T_{x_1} < T_{x_2} \wedge \tau_n) \times \max_{\alpha_1 \le \alpha_1'} P^{x_1}(K(\tau_n, x_1) = \alpha_1' - 1, K(\tau_n, x_2) = \alpha_2) \\
\ge& P(T_{x_1} < T_{x_2} \wedge \tau_n) \\
&\times \max_{\alpha_1 \le \alpha_1'} \sum_{0 \le i \le (\alpha_1'-1) \wedge (\alpha_2 - 1)} b_{1,1}^{\alpha_1'-1-i} b_{1,2}^{i+1} \frac{(\alpha_1'-1)!}{(\alpha_1'-1-i)!i!} b_{2,1}^{i} b_{2,2}^{\alpha_2-1-i} \frac{(\alpha_2-1)!}{(\alpha_2-1-i)!i!} \\
\ge& P(T_{x_1} < T_{x_2} \wedge \tau_n) \\
&\times \max_{\alpha_1 \le \alpha_1'} b_{1,1}^{\alpha_1'-1-i_0} b_{1,2}^{i_0+1} \frac{(\alpha_1'-1)!}{(\alpha_1'-1-i_0)!i_0!} b_{2,1}^{i_0} b_{2,2}^{\alpha_2-1-i_0} \frac{(\alpha_2-1)!}{(\alpha_2-1-i_0)!i_0!},
\end{aligned} \tag{7.60}
$$

where $s := \log d(x_1, x_2)/\log n$ and $i_0 = \sqrt{\alpha_1'\alpha_2}\pi(1-s)/(2s(2-s)\log n)$. Consider $0 < \epsilon < 1$. By (3.8) and (3.11), we obtain that for $i, l \in \{1, 2\}$ and uniformly in x_1, $x_2 \in D(0, n/3)$,

$$
b_{i,l} = \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{\pi}{2s(2-s)\log n}(1 + o(1)) & \text{if } i = l, \\ \frac{\pi(1-s)}{2s(2-s)\log n}(1 + o(1)) & \text{if } i \ne l. \end{cases} \tag{7.61}
$$

Therefore, if we apply the Stirling formula to the right most member of (7.60) with the aid of (7.61), we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
&P(x_1 \in \Psi_n(\alpha_1), x_2 \in \Psi_n(\alpha_2), T_{x_1} < T_{x_2} \wedge \tau_n) \\
\ge& P(T_{x_1} < T_{x_2} \wedge \tau_n) \\
&\times \exp\left\{ - \min_{\alpha_1 \le \alpha_1'} \left(\frac{2(\sqrt{\alpha_2} - \sqrt{\alpha_1'})^2}{\beta(2-\beta)} + \frac{4\sqrt{\alpha_1'\alpha_2}}{2-\beta} \right) \log n - \delta \log n \right\}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that (3.9) yields that there exists $c > 0$ such that

$$
P(T_{x_1} < T_{x_2} \wedge \tau_n) + P(T_{x_2} < T_{x_1} \wedge \tau_n) \ge P(T_{x_1} < \tau_n) \ge c.
$$

Therefore, if we estimate the summation over x_1, $x_2 \in D(0, n/3)$, by the symmetry of x_1 and x_2, the desired lower bound is completed.

Second, we will show the upper bound. If we change n in the definition of $b_{i.l}$ into $3n$, (3.8) and (3.11) yield (7.61). Let $\tilde{\alpha}_i = \lceil 4\alpha_i(\log n)^2/\pi \rceil$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then, (3.15) and (3.16) yield for x_1, $x_2 \in D(0, n)$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&P(x_1 \in \Psi_n(\alpha_1), x_2 \in \Psi_n(\alpha_2)) \\
\le& P(x_1 \in \Psi_{3n}(\alpha_1), x_2 \in \Psi_{3n}(\alpha_2), T_{x_1} < T_{x_2} \wedge \tau_{3n}) \\
+& P(x_1 \in \Psi_{3n}(\alpha_1), x_2 \in \Psi_{3n}(\alpha_2), T_{x_2} < T_{x_1} \wedge \tau_{3n}) \qquad (7.62) \\
\le& \sum_{\substack{0 \le i \le (\tilde{\alpha}_1'-1) \wedge (\tilde{\alpha}_2 - 1), \\ \tilde{\alpha}_1 \le \tilde{\alpha}_1'}} b_{1,1}^{\tilde{\alpha}_1'-1-i} b_{1,2}^{i+1} \frac{(\tilde{\alpha}_1'-1)!}{(\tilde{\alpha}_1'-1-i)!i!} b_{2,1}^{i} b_{2,2}^{\tilde{\alpha}_2-1-i} \frac{(\tilde{\alpha}_2-1)!}{(\tilde{\alpha}_2-1-i)!i!} \\
+& \sum_{\substack{1 \le i \le \tilde{\alpha}_1' \wedge (\tilde{\alpha}_2 - 1), \\ \tilde{\alpha}_1 \le \alpha_1'}} b_{1,1}^{\tilde{\alpha}_1'-1-i} b_{1,2}^{i} \frac{(\tilde{\alpha}_1'-1)!}{(\tilde{\alpha}_1'-i)!(i-1)!} b_{2,1}^{i} b_{2,2}^{\tilde{\alpha}_2-i} \frac{(\tilde{\alpha}_2-1)!}{(\tilde{\alpha}_2-1-i)!i!}. \qquad (7.63)
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that if we estimate the maximal term of below by same argument as (ii) in Lemma 13, (7.63) is

bounded by

$$
\begin{aligned}
&(\tilde{\alpha}_2+1)\\
&\times \max_{\substack{0\le i\le(\tilde{\alpha}_1'-1)\wedge\tilde{\alpha}_2,\\ \tilde{\alpha}_1\le\tilde{\alpha}_1'}} b_{1,1}^{\tilde{\alpha}_1'-1-i} b_{1,2}^{i} \frac{(\tilde{\alpha}_1'-1)!}{(\tilde{\alpha}_1'-1-i)!i!} b_{2,1}^{i} b_{2,2}^{\tilde{\alpha}_2-1-i} \frac{(\tilde{\alpha}_2-1)!}{(\tilde{\alpha}_2-1-i)!(i-1)!}\\
&\le \exp\left\{ -\min_{\alpha_1\le\alpha_1'} \left(\frac{2(\sqrt{\alpha_2}-\sqrt{\alpha_1'})^2}{\beta(2-\beta)} + \frac{4\sqrt{\alpha_1'\alpha_2}}{2-\beta} \right) \log n + \delta \log n \right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

for any $\alpha_1 \le \alpha_1', \alpha_2 \le \alpha_2'$. Therefore, a simple computation yields the desired upper bound. □

Proposition 26. *Fix $0<\beta<1$. Then, for any $\delta>0$ there exist $0<\delta'<1-\beta$ and $C>0$ such that for any x_1, $x_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_n^2$ with $n^\beta/4 \le d(x_1,x_2) \le 4n^{\beta+\delta'}$ and $n\in\mathbb{N}$,*

$$
\begin{aligned}
&C^{-1}\exp\left\{ -\min_{\alpha_1\le\alpha_1'} \left(\frac{2(\sqrt{\alpha_2}-\sqrt{\alpha_1'})^2}{\beta(2-\beta)} + \frac{4\sqrt{\alpha_1'\alpha_2}}{2-\beta} \right) \log n - \delta\log n \right\}\\
&\le P(x_1\in\mathcal{V}_n(\alpha_1), x_2\in\mathcal{V}_n(\alpha_2))\\
&\le C\exp\left\{ -\min_{\alpha_1\le\alpha_1'} \left(\frac{2(\sqrt{\alpha_2}-\sqrt{\alpha_1'})^2}{\beta(2-\beta)} + \frac{4\sqrt{\alpha_1'\alpha_2}}{2-\beta} \right) \log n + \delta\log n \right\}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof. By the simple computation, the definition of GFF, (3.3) and (7.61) yield that for any α_1', $\alpha_2'>0$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&P\left(\cap_{i=1,2} \left\{ \frac{1}{2}\phi_n^2(x_i) \ge \frac{4\alpha_i'}{\pi}(\log n)^2 \right\} \right)\\
&\le \exp\left\{ -\left(\frac{2(\sqrt{\alpha_2'}-\sqrt{\alpha_1'})^2}{\beta(2-\beta)} + \frac{4\sqrt{\alpha_1'\alpha_2'}}{2-\beta} \right) \log n + \delta\log n \right\},
\end{aligned}
$$

and in addition, the corresponding lower bound holds. Therefore, the simple computation yields the desired result. □

Proof of Theorems 22 and 23. If we again use the same method as that of Theorem 21, by using Proposition 25 or 26 instead of Proposition 24 with the minor modification, the desired results are completed. □

8 Appendix : Computation of exponents

In this section, we will show monotonicity of exponents on $j\in\mathbb{N}$ by using only elementary computation.

Lemma 27. *For any $j\ge 2$ and $0<\alpha,\beta<1$*

$$
\begin{aligned}
&(A)\ \hat{\rho}_j(\alpha,\beta) - \hat{\rho}_{j-1}(\alpha,\beta) \ge 0,\\
&(B)\ \rho_j(\alpha,\beta) - \rho_{j-1}(\alpha,\beta) \ge 0.
\end{aligned}
$$

Remark 8. *As discussed previously, this result yields Theorems 1 and 2. In addition, (B) in above lemma is equivalent to Theorem 1, and (A) is equivalent to Theorem 2. Indeed, for any $0<\alpha,\beta<1$*

$$
|\{(x_1,...,x_j)\in\mathcal{L}_n(\alpha)^j : d(x_i,x_l)\le n^\beta \text{ for any } 1\le i,l\le j\}|
$$

is monotonically increasing in $j\in\mathbb{N}$. Hence, Theorems 1 and 2 naturally yield above lemma.

Proof. First, we will prove (A) for $j = 2$. Consider $\beta \le (2 - \sqrt{2\alpha}) \wedge 1$. Note that $2\beta - 4\alpha/(2-\beta)$ is monotonically increasing in $\beta \in [0, 1]$, and

$$\hat{\rho}_2(\alpha, 1) - \hat{\rho}_1(\alpha, 1) = 4(1-\alpha) - 2(1-\alpha) \ge 0.$$

Hence, we have the desired result. In addition, we consider $\beta \ge 2 - \sqrt{2\alpha}$. Since $-4\sqrt{2\alpha} + 2\alpha$ is monotonically decreasing in α,

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\rho}_2(\alpha, \beta) - \hat{\rho}_1(\alpha, \beta) =& 6 - 4\sqrt{2\alpha} - (2 - 2\alpha) \\ \ge& 4 - 4\sqrt{2\alpha} + 2\alpha \\ \ge& 6 - 4\sqrt{2} \ge 0.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have (A) for $j = 2$.

Second, we will prove (B) for $j = 2$. Consider $\beta \le (2 - 2\sqrt{\alpha}) \wedge 1$. Note that $2 - 2\sqrt{\alpha} \le 2 - \sqrt{2\alpha}$. Then, by the same argument as (A) for $\beta \le (2 - \sqrt{2\alpha}) \wedge 1$, we have the desired result. In addition, we consider $\beta \ge 2 - 2\sqrt{\alpha}$. Since $4(1 - \sqrt{\alpha})^2/\beta$ is monotonically decreasing in β,

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_2(\alpha, \beta) - \rho_1(\alpha, \beta) =& 8(1 - \sqrt{\alpha}) - 4(1 - \sqrt{\alpha})^2/\beta - (2 - 2\alpha) \\ \ge& 8(1 - \sqrt{\alpha}) - 2(1 - \sqrt{\alpha}) - (2 - 2\alpha) \\ =& 2(2 - \sqrt{\alpha})(1 - \sqrt{\alpha}) \ge 0.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have (B).

Next we will prove (A) for $j \ge 3$. Let $\varphi(\alpha, j) := (1 - \sqrt{j\alpha})/(j-1)$, $\zeta(\alpha, \beta, j) := 2j\alpha/(1 + (j-1)(1-\beta))$.

(i) $\beta \le (1 + \varphi(\alpha, j-1)) \wedge (1 + \varphi(\alpha, j))$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta(\alpha, \beta, j) - \zeta(\alpha, \beta, j-1) =& \frac{2\alpha\beta}{(1 + (j-1)(1-\beta))(1 + (j-2)(1-\beta))} \\ \le& \frac{2\alpha\beta}{(1 + (j-2)(1-\beta))^2}\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\max_{\substack{0 \le \beta \le 1 + \varphi(\alpha, j-1), \\ j \ge 3}} \frac{2\alpha}{(1 + (j-2)(1-\beta))^2} = \max_{j \ge 3} \frac{2\alpha}{(j-1)\alpha} = 1.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}&\hat{\rho}_j(\alpha, \beta) - \hat{\rho}_{j-1}(\alpha, \beta) \\ =& 2 + 2(j-1)\beta - \zeta(\alpha, \beta, j) - (2 + 2(j-2)\beta - \zeta(\alpha, \beta, j-1)) \\ \ge& 2\beta - \beta \ge 0.\end{aligned}$$

(ii) $1 + \varphi(\alpha, j-1) \le 1 + \varphi(\alpha, j)$ and $1 + \varphi(\alpha, j-1) \le \beta \le 1 + \varphi(\alpha, j)$

$$\begin{aligned}&\hat{\rho}_j(\alpha, \beta) - \hat{\rho}_{j-1}(\alpha, \beta) \\ =& 2 + 2(j-1)\beta - \zeta(\alpha, \beta, j) - (2j - 4\sqrt{(j-1)\alpha}) \\ \ge& 2 + 2(j-1)\beta - 2\sqrt{j\alpha} - (2j - 4\sqrt{(j-1)\alpha}) \\ \ge& 2j + \frac{2(j-1)}{j-2}(1 - \sqrt{(j-1)\alpha}) - 2\sqrt{j\alpha} - (2j - 4\sqrt{(j-1)\alpha}) \\ =& \frac{2(j-1) - 2\sqrt{(j-1)\alpha}}{j-2} + 2\sqrt{\alpha}(\sqrt{j-1} - \sqrt{j}) \\ \ge& \frac{2(j-1) - 2\sqrt{j-1}}{j-2} + 2(\sqrt{j-1} - \sqrt{j}) \\ \ge& 4 - 2\sqrt{2} + 2\sqrt{2} - 2\sqrt{3} \ge 0.\end{aligned}$$

The first inequality comes from the fact that $1+\varphi(\alpha,j-1) \le \beta \le 1 \wedge (1+\varphi(\alpha,j))$ and the second inequality comes from $1+\varphi(\alpha,j-1) \le \beta$. The third inequality comes from monotonicity in α. The forth inequality comes from the fact that $(2(j-1)-2\sqrt{j-1})/(j-2)$ and $\sqrt{j-1}-\sqrt{j}$ are monotonically increasing for j and considering the case $j=3$.

(iii) $1+\varphi(\alpha,j) \le 1+\varphi(\alpha,j-1)$ and $1+\varphi(\alpha,j) \le \beta \le 1+\varphi(\alpha,j-1)$

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\rho}_j(\alpha,\beta)-\hat{\rho}_{j-1}(\alpha,\beta) =& 2(j+1)-4\sqrt{j\alpha}-(2+2(j-2)\beta-\zeta(\alpha,\beta,j-1)) \\ \ge& 2(j+1)-4\sqrt{j\alpha}-(2j-4\sqrt{(j-1)\alpha}) \\ \ge& 2-4\sqrt{j}+4\sqrt{j-1} \\ \ge& 2-4\sqrt{3}+4\sqrt{2} \ge 0.\end{aligned}$$

The first inequality comes from the fact that $2(j-2)\beta-\zeta(\alpha,\beta,j-1)$ is monotonically increasing in β with $\beta \le 1+\varphi(\alpha,j-1)$. The second inequality comes from the fact that $-4\sqrt{j\alpha}+4\sqrt{(j-1)\alpha}$ is monotonically decreasing in α.

(iv) $(1+\varphi(\alpha,j)) \vee (1+\varphi(\alpha,j-1)) \le \beta$

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\rho}_j(\alpha,\beta)-\hat{\rho}_{j-1}(\alpha,\beta) =& 2+2j-4\sqrt{j\alpha}-(2j-4\sqrt{(j-1)\alpha}) \\ \ge& 2-4\sqrt{j\alpha}+4\sqrt{(j-1)\alpha} \\ \ge& 2-4\sqrt{j}+4\sqrt{j-1} \\ \ge& 2-4\sqrt{3}+4\sqrt{2} \ge 0.\end{aligned}$$

The second inequality comes from the fact that $-4\sqrt{j\alpha}+4\sqrt{(j-1)\alpha}$ is monotonically decreasing in α. Therefore, the desired result is completed.

Next we will prove (B) for $j \ge 3$. Since $j(1-\sqrt{\alpha})/(j-1)$ is monotonically decreasing in j, it suffices to show the following three cases *(i)*, *(ii)*, *(iii)*:

(i) $\beta \le \frac{j}{j-1}(1-\sqrt{\alpha})$

Note that $j(1-\sqrt{\alpha})/(j-1) \le (1+\varphi(\alpha,j)) \wedge (1+\varphi(\alpha,j-1))$. Then, by the same argument as that of (A) for $\beta \le (1+\varphi(\alpha,j)) \wedge (1+\varphi(\alpha,j-1))$, the desired result holds.

(ii) $\frac{j-1}{j-2}(1-\sqrt{\alpha}) \le \beta$

$$\begin{aligned}&\rho_j(\alpha,\beta)-\rho_{j-1}(\alpha,\beta) \\ =& 4j(1-\sqrt{\alpha})-2j(1-\sqrt{\alpha})^2/\beta-(4(j-1)(1-\sqrt{\alpha})-2(j-1)(1-\sqrt{\alpha})^2/\beta) \\ \ge& 4(1-\sqrt{\alpha})-2(1-\sqrt{\alpha})^2/\beta \\ \ge& 4(1-\sqrt{\alpha})-2(1-\sqrt{\alpha}) \ge 0.\end{aligned}$$

The second inequality comes from the fact that $2(1-\sqrt{\alpha})^2/\beta$ is monotonically increasing in β and considering the case $\beta = 1-\alpha$.

(iii) $\frac{j}{j-1}(1-\sqrt{\alpha}) \le \beta \le \frac{j-1}{j-2}(1-\sqrt{\alpha})$

$$\begin{aligned}&\rho_j(\alpha,\beta)-\rho_{j-1}(\alpha,\beta) \\ =& 4j(1-\sqrt{\alpha})-2j(1-\sqrt{\alpha})^2/\beta-(2+2(j-2)\beta-\zeta(\alpha,\beta,j-1)) \\ \ge& 4j(1-\sqrt{\alpha})-2j(1-\sqrt{\alpha})^2/\beta-(4(j-1)(1-\sqrt{\alpha})-2(j-1)(1-\sqrt{\alpha})^2/\beta).\end{aligned}$$

The inequality comes from the fact that $2(j-2)\beta-\zeta(\alpha,\beta,j-1)$ is monotonically increasing in β. Then, by the same argument as *(ii)*, the desired result is completed. Therefore, we obtain (B) for $j \ge 3$. □

Acknowledgments.

We are grateful to Prof. Kazumasa Kuwada and Kohei Uchiyama for interesting discussion. In addition, we would thank to Yoshihiro Abe for helpful comments.

References

[1] Bolthausen, E. , Deuschel, J. D. and Giacomin, G.: Entropic repulsion and the maximum of the two-dimensional harmonic crystal. Ann. Probab., **29**, 1670–1692 (2001)

[2] Brummelhuis, M. and Hilhorst, H.: Coverling of a finite lattice by a random walk. Phys. A, **176**. 387–408 (1991)

[3] Daviaud, O.: Extremes of the discrete two-dimensional Gaussian free field. Ann. Probab., **34**. 962–986 (2006)

[4] Dembo, A.: Favorite points, cover times and fractals. In Lectures on Probability Theory and Statistics, volume **1869** of Lecture Notes in Math., pages 1–101. Springer, Berlin. Lectures from the 33rd Probability Summer School held in Saint-Flour, July, 6–23 (2003)

[5] Dembo, A.: Simple random covering, disconnection, late and favorite points. Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Madrid , Volume **III**. 535–558 (2006)

[6] Dembo, A. , Peres, Y. and Rosen, J.: How large a disc is covered by a random walk in n steps? Ann. Probab., **35**, 577–601 (2007)

[7] Dembo, A. , Peres, Y. , Rosen, J. and Zeitouni, O.: Thick points for planar Brownian motion and the Erdős-Taylor conjecture on random walk. Acta Math., **186**, 239–270 (2001)

[8] Dembo, A. , Peres, Y. , Rosen, J. and Zeitouni, O.: Cover times for Brownian motion and random walks in two dimensions. Ann. Math., **160**, 433–464 (2004)

[9] Dembo, A. , Peres, Y. , Rosen, J. , Zeitouni, O.: Late points for random walks in two dimensions. Ann. Probab., **34**, 219–263 (2006)

[10] Ding, J.: Asymptotics of cover times via Gaussian free fields: Bounded-degree graphs and general trees. Ann. Probab., **42**, 464–496 (2014)

[11] Ding, J. , Lee, J. R. , Peres, Y.: Cover times, blanket times, and majorizing measures. Ann. of Math., **175**, 1409–1471 (2012)

[12] Eisenbaum, N. , Kaspi, H. , Marcus, M. B. , Rosen, J. , Shi, Z.: A Ray-Knight theorem for symmetric Markov processes. Ann. Probab., **28**, 1781–1796 (2000)

[13] Erdős, P. , Révész, P.: On the favourite points of a random walk. Mathematical Structures Computational Mathematics Mathematical Modelling, **2**, 152–157. (1984)

[14] Erdős, P. and Révész, P.: Problems and results on random walks. In: Mathematical Statistics and Probability (P. Bauer et al., eds.), Proceedings of the 6th Pannonian Symposium, Volume **B**, 59–65 (1987)

[15] Erdős, P., Taylor, S. J.: Some problems concerning the structure of random walk paths. Acta Sci. Hung., **11**, 137–162 (1960)

[16] Lawler, G. F.: Intersections of Random Walks. Birkhauser, Boston (1991)

[17] Lifshits, M. A., Shi, Z.: The escape rate of favorite sites of simple random walk and Brownian motion, Ann. Probab., **32**, 129–152 (2004)

[18] Okada, I.: Frequently visited sites of the inner boundary of random walk range. Stochastic Process. Appl., to appear (2016)

[19] Rosen, J.: A random walk proof of the Erdős-Taylor conjecture. Periodica Mathematica Hungarica., **50**, 223–245 (2005)

[20] Sheffield, S.: Gaussian free fields for mathematicians. Probab. Theory Related Fields **139** 521–541 (2003)

[21] Shi, Z. and Tóth, B.: Favourite sites of simple random walk. Periodica Mathematica Hungarica., **41**, 237–249 (2000)